

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HISPANICS AND JOBS: BARRIERS  
TO PROGRESS

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recommend to my colleagues the report by the National Commission for Employment Policy. This report, "Hispanics and Jobs: Barriers to Progress," focused on the difficulties Hispanic Americans have in finding and keeping good jobs.

The report emphasizes that Hispanic Americans face three barriers to success in the job market: lack of proficiency in English, low levels of formal schooling, and discrimination. By far the most important barrier is difficulty with English.

Hispanics are a sizable and growing part of the U.S. population. They fare almost as badly as blacks in the labor market, judged by unemployment and wages. Moreover, their school-dropout rates are higher than either blacks or whites.

The Hispanic subgroups, however, suffer in very different ways and to different degrees. This diversity of problems reflects the varieties of location, education, and immigration/settlement histories of the peoples called "Hispanics."

I have enclosed a summary of the National Commission for Employment Policy report and encourage my colleagues to read it.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Hispanic-Americans are a sizeable and growing part of the U.S. population. Many have problems finding good jobs and earning a decent income even in prosperous times. The dimensions of their difficulties are often hidden by figures on the position of all Hispanic-Americans, since the type of problem differs among Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cuban-Americans, and persons from Central and South America. For some, finding work is a severe problem; for others, low pay is the major issue.

At the same time, Hispanics generally experience common barriers to labor market success: lack of proficiency in English, low levels of formal schooling, and discrimination. Difficulties communicating in English directly reduce their prospects for good jobs, impede their educational attainment, and operate as a vehicle for labor market discrimination.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF HISPANICS

The 1980 census estimates that there are 14.6 Hispanic-Americans living on the U.S. mainland and another 3.2 million in Puerto Rico. They are 6.5 percent of the population on the mainland, up from 4.5 percent a decade ago.

Hispanics differ from the rest of the U.S. population in several important ways.

Hispanics are geographically concentrated in a few States. Two-thirds live in California, New York, Texas, and Florida; less than one-third of the total population lives in these States.

Hispanics are more likely than the rest of the population to be immigrants. In 1970, about 1 out of every 4 Hispanics was foreign born, compared to 1 out of 20 in the total population.

Hispanic adults have fewer years of schooling than either whites or blacks. Among persons over age 25 (when most people have finished their schooling), half of the Hispanic population has completed fewer than 11 years of schooling, about 2 years less than whites, and 1½ years less than blacks.

Many Hispanic adults, whether native or immigrant, have problems communicating in English. Almost 15 percent of those 21 years or older speak only Spanish and almost 30 percent consider Spanish to be their major language.

Hispanics are a young population. Half are under age 24 and almost one-third are under age 15. Half of the white population is under age 31 and about 20 percent are under age 15.

Many Hispanic youth leave school before graduation. Their dropout rate is about 1½ times that of blacks and almost 3 times that of whites.

Many Hispanic youth have problems with English. About 70 percent of those age 5 to 14 (or 1.7 million children) who have been raised in Spanish-speaking homes have limited proficiency in English.

The experiences of Hispanics in the job market differ from those of blacks and whites.

The rate of participation in the labor force among Hispanic men is as high as that of whites and above that of blacks. Hispanic and white women have about the same rate of participation, which is below that of black women. Hispanic youth participate in the job market at a rate below that of whites but above that of blacks.

The unemployment rates of Hispanic men, women, and youth are above those of whites, but below those of blacks.

Hispanics are more likely to be in blue-collar jobs than either whites or blacks.

Hispanic men earn less per hour than black or white men. All groups of women earn less than men and Hispanic women earn the least per hour among women.

The annual income of Hispanics is between that of blacks and whites.

## THE DIVERSITY OF THE HISPANIC POPULATION

The majority of Hispanics on the mainland are Mexican-Americans (60 percent). Fourteen percent are Puerto Rican, 6 percent are Cuban-American, 8 percent are from Central and South America, and 12 percent are "other Spanish." This last group includes persons of mixed Hispanic background.

Because most Hispanics are Mexican-American, statistics on Hispanics as a group largely reflect the experiences of Mexican-Americans and tend to obscure trends and problems of the other groups. The several

groups of Hispanics differ in important ways.

They are located in a few widely separated regions of the U.S. with different rates of economic growth and different occupation/industry mixes. In general, Mexican-Americans are located in the Southwest; Puerto Ricans on the mainland live mainly in the Northeast; and most Cuban-Americans in Florida.

The groups become citizens in different ways and at different times. Mexicans' land was annexed by the U.S. in the mid-1840's. By 1970, about 50 percent were at least second-generation Americans and less than 20 percent were immigrants. Puerto Ricans also became Americans when the island was annexed by the U.S. in 1898. A unique characteristic of this group is their frequent migration between the Spanish-speaking island and the English-speaking mainland. The vast majority of Cubans are immigrants and children of immigrants who began arriving in the U.S. in the early 1960's. Most Central/South Americans are also recent immigrants.

Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans are, on average, a young population. Their median age is 22 years, 8 years below the median age of non-Hispanics. By contrast, Cuban-Americans are a relatively old group; their median age is 36 years.

Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans have a low level of education. Those over 25 years old have a median education of 9 and 10 school years, respectively. The comparable figure is about 12½ years for the total U.S. population. The low levels of education are partly due to the lack of schooling of immigrants, who comprise a larger proportion of these groups than of the non-Hispanic population. However, native Mexican-Americans and mainland-born Puerto Ricans average at least 1 year less of schooling than white non-Hispanics of the same age. By contrast, Cubans are a well-educated group. Their median formal education is about the same as that of the non-Hispanic population.

Due to their different characteristics, the Hispanic groups have different experiences in the job market.

Difficulties finding work—as indicated by low rates of participation in the labor force and high rates of unemployment—are especially severe for Puerto Rican men and women both on the island and on the mainland. By these two measures they fare no better than blacks.

Mexican-American men have the largest proportion in blue-collar jobs and they earn less per hour than any other group of men. Mexican-American women have high rates of unemployment and earn less than the other groups of Hispanic and non-Hispanic men and women.

Compared to the other Hispanic groups, Cuban men and women do well in the labor market: their participation in the labor force is high, unemployment is low, and their median personal income is also high. On the other hand, their income position is substantially below that of non-Hispanic whites. Also, these figures exclude a large number of Cubans—the recent Mariel refu-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

gees, of whom a substantial number are jobless.

#### REASONS FOR HISPANICS' PROBLEMS IN THE JOB MARKET

Determining the reasons for Hispanics' difficulties in the labor market is an empirical problem. The goal is to disentangle the effects (for example, on wages) of various characteristics such as location, immigrant status, age, education, and proficiency in English.

Research shows that while the several groups experience different labor market problems, the major causes are the same: lack of proficiency in English, low levels of formal schooling, and discrimination in the labor market. In this context, "lack of proficiency in English" means not only a limited ability to speak and understand the language, but also an infrequent use of English.

Research also suggests that the Hispanic groups are treated differently in the job market. However, due to Hispanics' widely scattered locations and to limited data, it is not possible to determine whether these differences reflect the effects of (1) belonging to a particular Hispanic group or (2) living and working in a particular place.

In general, Hispanic men who have problems with English earn less than those who are proficient. Language difficulties for women are associated, on average, with reduced participation in the labor force. Language is also associated with reduced earnings among women who have 12 or more years of education.

Hispanics' low levels of education, operating separately and in combination with their language problems, are another important reason for their low wages and poor occupational position. Lack of formal schooling has a particularly strong effect on the wages of Mexican-American men and women.

Language deficiencies are one vehicle through which discrimination against Hispanics occurs in the labor market. Even among men with similar language problems, Hispanics are in lower-paying occupations than non-Hispanics. Evidence indicates that discrimination against Hispanic men on the basis of their ethnic, as well as their linguistic, characteristics contributes to their low wages, although its severity varies among the several groups of Hispanic men. Discrimination has not been found to be a cause of differences in pay between Hispanic and non-Hispanic women.

#### GOVERNMENT ACTIONS TO IMPROVE HISPANICS' POSITION

There have been several important governmental actions that seek to reduce Hispanics' problems in the job market. Bilingual education was designed to help all language minorities, but it is considered by the Hispanic community to have been a major instrument of the Federal Government to help Hispanics enter the American mainstream. Federal training programs are also considered here.

#### BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Over the past two decades the Federal Government has supported educational programs sensitive to the needs of young people whose first language is not English. The three major components of this support are title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, and the Supreme Court's 1974 decision in *Lau v. Nichols*. The Supreme Court ruled that students whose first language is not English do not receive an education free

from unlawful discrimination if they are instructed in English, without regard to their language difficulties.

There are several approaches to teaching language-minority students: English as a second language, transitional bilingual, bilingual bicultural, and structured immersion. The goal of each program is to teach English to the students while continuing their education in other subject areas. Bilingual bicultural programs give equal emphasis to parallel development of the students' own languages and cultures.

There are examples of successful projects for each of these approaches, but there is no consensus regarding which program works best. The literature does show that to be effective, individual programs should consider the students' age, social background, and educational needs. Also, the programs must have sufficient teaching materials and adequately trained staffs.

#### FEDERALLY SPONSORED TRAINING PROGRAMS

Federally sponsored training programs, such as those authorized by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (CETA), are available to economically disadvantaged persons who wish to improve their skills. In general, more Hispanics participated in CETA training programs than would be expected on the basis of their proportion of the national eligible population.

The services and treatment Hispanics received did not differ from that of blacks and whites, once differences in program-relevant characteristics were taken into account. However, Hispanic women were more likely than men to be training for (or working in) low-paying jobs.

Analyses of all racial and ethnic groups of participants indicate that after completing the training program, men's yearly earnings did not increase above those of otherwise similar men who had not been in a training program. Women's yearly earnings rose above those of the comparison group, largely due to higher levels of employment, and somewhat to higher wages.●

#### LAW OF THE SEA: A RIP-OFF

#### HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues a recent editorial from the Dallas Morning News concerning the President's decision not to sign the Law of the Sea Treaty.

Rena Pederson, an editorial staff writer, has done a highly commendable job of presenting the essence of the treaty's problems. If more members of the media would follow her example, the anger of the American people over this treaty would surpass any we have seen in years.

The article follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Dec. 15, 1982]

#### LAW OF SEA: A RIP-OFF

(By Rena Pederson)

The diplomatic tug of war over the law of the sea treaty is one of those issues that tend to make your eyes glaze over at the first mention.

Yet the treaty is considered the most important document since the adoption of the U.N. Charter.

It affects every aspect of the seas. It confirms the right of ships to pass through important straits and waterways. It settles disputes regarding fishing rights. It covers overflight rights for aircraft. And it sets out rules for seabed mining, which some say is the underwater bonanza of the future.

Thanks to new developments in technology, made by Dallas companies such as SEDCO and Dresser Industries, some 1.5 trillion tons of manganese, nickel, copper and cobalt can be harvested in the coming decades as potato-sized nodules on the ocean floor.

Now mining cobalt potatoes may not seem a red-hot issue. But considering that much of American industry depends on those minerals, you can imagine why the United States is interested in a treaty to determine the territorial rules of the game. And considering the trillion-dollar treasure at stake, you can also imagine why all the underdeveloped countries in the United Nations want a piece of the action.

That's where the problems come in. The treaty also contains some cockeyed requirements for forcing industrial countries to share their profits and technology with other countries—including the PLO and Soviet Union. It was those later provisions that caused the United States, which helped start the Law of the Sea negotiations nine years ago—to decide not to sign the treaty.

It has not been a popular decision abroad. Countries such as France, which caters to the Third World countries dominating the United Nations, have supported the treaty. And so has the Soviet Union, which would dearly love to have access to the American seabed mining technology, much of which has strategic applications.

And it has not been a well-understood decision domestically. Editorials have been savaging the Reagan administration for abandoning the treaty.

But ask yourself what you would do. To get an exploration contract, a company would have to provide the Seabed Authority with detailed research on two sites, so the authority could use one or give it to a poor nation. To use the other site, the company would have to agree to share its technology with the authority. Even if the company finally got approval to mine, the rate of removal would be governed by the authority so as to protect countries with land-mining operations, such as the Soviet Union and Gabon (manganese), Zaire and Zambia (cobalt), Canada (nickel) and Chile (copper).

Along the way, the company would have to pay stiff fees up to a million dollars every year until production began, and taxes as high as 50 percent. Not only that, but the authority's governing board would be weighted with Third World countries and the Soviet bloc. The United States, whose companies are expected to do the bulk of any privately financed seabed mining would not be guaranteed a single seat on the 36-member board.

Such a deal. Would you sign the treaty and hold your country's vital industries hostage to a global bureaucracy in which you have almost no voice? Probably not. And that's what the Reagan administration reluctantly decided, even though its negotiators approved of 90 percent of the rest of the treaty.

Over the weekend, 117 other nations did sign the treaty at a meeting in Jamaica. That's nearly twice the 60 countries needed



for implementation. But 22 other countries chose to delay signing, pending further study, including Great Britain, West Germany and Japan. That keeps alive the slim hope that if enough major industrial countries back away from the treaty, the seabed provisions will be restructured.

In the meantime, legislation is being offered in Congress to establish a 200-mile economic zone, define the limits of the U.S. continental shelf and set procedures for scientific research in U.S. waters, things that also would have been covered in the treaty.

What the administration is trying to do is keep debating the critical issues while trying to set up mini-treaties of its own. It's a risky gamble, but agreeing to give away American technology to hostile countries would be even more dangerous. That's what the public needs to understand, if they can be convinced to care about something that sounds as boring as the Law of the Sea Treaty.●

#### TRIBUTE TO ADAM BENJAMIN

##### HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the well-deserved tribute paid by the Indiana Legislature to our dearly departed colleague, Adam Benjamin:

#### INDIANA LEGISLATURE RESOLUTION

A concurrent resolution urging the Congress of the United States to authorize a small boat marina within the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore to be named "The Adam Benjamin, Jr. Memorial Marina."

Whereas Congressman Adam Benjamin, Jr. worked unceasingly for the betterment of Lake County, Indiana, by supporting, during his tenure as United States Congressional Representative for the First Congressional District of the State of Indiana, numerous programs and projects designed to improve the quality of life in his district and county; and

Whereas one of the primary projects developed and nurtured by Congressman Adam Benjamin, Jr. was the expansion and development of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore; and

Whereas one of the dreams of Congressman Adam Benjamin, Jr. and the constituents he represented was construction of a small boat marina as part of the west unit of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore; and

Whereas the construction of a small boat marina within the west unit of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Park was identified as a first priority development element in the park's general management plan; and

Whereas in 1980 the Congress of the United States reviewed the general management plan and the United States Department of Interior approved the plan; and

Whereas through the continued support and coordination of Congressman Adam Benjamin, Jr., several hundred thousand dollars have been spent by the City of Gary, the Lake County Parks and Recreation Department, and the United States Department of Interior for the planning of such a marina; and

Whereas the people of Indiana believe that Congressman Adam Benjamin, Jr. should be honored and forever remembered

for the dedicated service he gave to the citizens of his district, county, and state: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the House of Representatives concurring therein):*

Section 1. That we urge the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of a small boat marina in Lake County, Indiana within the west unit of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Park, to be named "The Adam Benjamin, Jr. Memorial Marina".

Section 2. The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States the Secretary of the Interior, the leadership of each party of each House of Congress, and each member of the Indiana congressional delegation.

Adopted by voice vote this sixteenth day of November, 1982.●

#### THE STATEMENT OF PATRICIA BREWER

##### HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I submitted to the RECORD a statement from a constituent with which I did not agree. Today, I am doing so again. My colleagues may wonder why I am doing this. At a hearing I held on child welfare and the New Federalism in Connecticut, two persons felt that they had not been provided the opportunity to present their views. One gentleman is opposed to abortion; he had his say in the RECORD yesterday. Patricia Brewer, coordinator of the Connecticut Catholic Conference, is in favor of tuition tax credits. Although I do not share her views, I did want to fulfill my promise to her that those views would be presented to this body.

Ms. Brewer's statement follows:

I am Patricia J. Brewer. I am a Doctor of Philosophy with an academic concentration in Anthropology and Folklore. I am a long-time participant in the Connecticut educational scene having taught in Connecticut's nonpublic school system on the elementary, secondary, and collegiate levels. I am presently associated with the Connecticut Catholic Conference.

I speak in favor of that aspect of the New Federalism which would allow parents to retain enough of their own earnings to choose the education they want for their children. Specifically, I speak in favor of the Educational Equity and Opportunity Bill: the tuition tax credit legislation which is set for mark-up this week in the Senate Finance Committee. I am here to ask that you give some fresh and clear thought to the justice of our present system of educational finance and that you cease active opposition and begin active support of legislation that would aid many of your constituents in the performance of the most sacred of their duties: the formation of the minds and hearts of their children.

Parents have the moral responsibility and the constitutionally guaranteed right to educate their children according to their re-

ligio-cultural values. Until recently, parents who chose to educate their children in an institution which transmitted Judeo-Christian values had little trouble doing so. They had access to the public, the private, and the parochial schools. All were Judeo-Christian in orientation. Two of them—the public and the parochial were tuition free, the public schools being supported by the state tax dollar, the parochial by both the Church tax and the contributed services of religious teachers.

Not so today. Today, in recognition of our society's religio-cultural pluralism and thanks to several supreme court decisions, the specific teaching of Judeo-Christian values is prohibited in our public schools. Today, in response to the dramatic decline in the contributed services of religious teachers and the inability of the Church tax to sustain the full cost of parochial education, parish schools charge tuition.

Consequently, for most of the poor and the nearly poor and for many of the middle class, there is today no educational choice, there is no educational freedom. Compelled by law and conscience to send their children to school, and unable to pay the tuition to send them to a nonpublic school, some parents are in a real sense coerced to educate their children in a manner abhorrent to their religio-cultural values. It seems clear that, whatever may have been its justification in the past, our present system of educational finance is neither just nor democratic. Coercion is hardly a principle sacred to democracy.

I am aware that both you, Representative Moffett, and you Representative Kennelly, concerned as you are, and as you should be, with maintaining a quality school system, accessible to all, presently oppose tuition tax credit legislation. I am aware also of the clichéd bugbears which are bandied about by the organized, vested-interest opposition to the legislation. Because I recognize in your prepared statements of rationale for opposition to tuition tax credits these bugbears, I would like to confront some of them with you.

The opposition says: Tuition tax credits would lead to the demise of the public school system. They would serve as an incentive to parents to remove their children from the public school. Only the dregs would be left in the public schools.

I say: Nonsense. Tuition tax credits when fully funded would pay only half of actual tuition cost up to a maximum of \$500. Parents sending their children to public schools presently receive an average benefit of \$3000 per child from their tax dollars.

The opposition says: Tax credits would take badly needed money from the public schools.

I say: Not so. During the first year of its implementation the tax credit would cost the federal government \$100,000,000 in federal revenue loss. In its out-year, when fully funded, the estimated loss would be \$1,500,000,000. That revenue loss, when prorated against the entire federal budget would be minuscule. The loss to the budget could easily be balanced by manufacturing one less Trident Submarine. There is no reason to believe that Congress will appropriate one penny more or less to public education because it has allowed citizens who have chosen nonpublic education to withhold some of their earnings to help finance that choice.

The opposition says: The tuition tax credits would benefit the wealthy and not the poor.

I say: It is the marginally poor who will benefit most from the tax credit. It is to the parent who can scrape up \$200 to pay half his child's tuition—but can't get together the \$400 to pay the full tuition that the tax credit will make the difference between educational freedom and educational coercion.

The \$500 maximum tuition credit will hardly influence the decision of a parent paying \$8500 to send his child to a Cheshire Academy—or a Choate Rosemary.

The opposition says: Tuition tax credits are unconstitutional.

I say: There has never been a Federal Tuition Tax Credit. A decision on the constitutionality of that legislation is yet to be had. Students of the Constitution argue for constitutionality. The Supreme Court will and should make this decision—not the legislators.

Representative Moffett—Representative Kennelly, words, whether full of reason or full of sound and fury signify nothing to the ears of those who will not hear. I hope that my words this morning have been somewhat reasonable. I trust that they have not fallen on deaf ears. It would be a privilege to discuss this matter in detail with either or both of you. ●

### THE SOUTH BRONX'S ECONOMIC REVIVAL

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the South Bronx is in the early stages of a dramatic revitalization effort. Decreases in arson and burglary, as well as signs of economic recovery, are driving businesses back into this once highly prosperous region.

In the past 12 months, 134 companies have moved into or expanded in the South Bronx. Electrical demand, commercial phone usage, and business activity are up for the first time in years. Perhaps the most encouraging statistics are those showing that robberies and burglaries, the most common problems for businesses, are down by as much as 36 percent in recent months.

Our reviving community offers numerous attractions for an incoming business. Rents are inexpensive, there is a large supply of trainable labor, and the location provides easy access to Manhattan's profitable market. In addition, a strong transportation network and an innovative Con Edison electricity savings program have served to entice prospective businessmen.

I submit this article, a testimony to the atmosphere of revitalization that has taken hold in the South Bronx, for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 16, 1982]

### NEW YORK CITY'S BURNED-OUT SOUTH BRONX STARTS A COMEBACK AS FIRMS SLOWLY RETURN

(By Luis Ubinas)

NEW YORK.—The South Bronx, long a national symbol of ruin and despair, is slowly rebuilding itself.

Electrical demand, commercial phone usage and business activity are all up for the first time in years. The New York State Department of Commerce reports that in the past 12 months five businesses have been moving into or expanding in the South Bronx for every three that leave or cut back. Businessmen point to cheap rents, available labor and good location as reasons for moving into the area.

And local businessmen and politicians have begun to tackle what is perhaps the most difficult task, that of improving the area's image.

Many Americans were introduced to the South Bronx in 1977, when President Carter stood before television cameras on Charlotte Street in one of the most devastated sections of New York City. Amid acres of burned-out buildings and rubble-strewn vacant lots, the president promised to redevelop the area.

#### TEN-YEAR-OLD PROBLEMS

That plan fell through. Working against optimism were problems that had had more than 10 years to take root.

In the mid-1960s, drug use, arson and robbery had begun to drive out the tool makers, metal smelters and textile mills that were the backbone of the South Bronx economy. Old-timers in the area tell of prominent businessmen being murdered and of business deals ruined when visitors were accosted by derelicts.

Only minutes from midtown Manhattan and some of the world's most expensive real estate, the South Bronx came to be portrayed by the news media as a battlefield where arsonists and thieves were winning the fight against police and nearly half a million residents.

By 1979, when street crime and arson peaked, the area was at rock bottom and the future looked bleak. Donald DiMuro, executive director of the Bronx Chamber of Commerce, says, "We were left with nothing."

#### SOME COMPANIES MOVE IN

But lately, things have begun to look up. Aircraft Supplies Inc., a manufacturer of airplane parts, has moved from New Jersey into the South Bronx. Arlene Blatt, the company's executive vice president, says, "At first I was a little afraid, but rent of \$2.50 a square foot on a long-term lease was unbeatable." When it reaches full production later this year, the company will employ as many as 450 workers.

Panorama Windows Ltd. also moved in to take advantage of low rents. The company relocated last month from fashionable quarters on Manhattan's East Side to a factory near the Triborough Bridge. The company's president and owner, Peter Folsom says, "The 5,000 square feet of yard space and 5,000 square feet of interior space we were able to buy here didn't exist in Manhattan at any price."

Richard Slavin, of Houlihan-Parnes. Realtors, says, "Over the past few months there have been fewer vacancies than there have been in years." Rents now are up to between \$5 and \$7 a square foot, but are still below costs in Manhattan and most nearby suburban locations, according to Realtors.

#### CHEAP, TRAINABLE LABOR

Some companies find the South Bronx attractive because of what an executive calls "cheap, trainable labor." The Welbilt Electronic Die Corp., a defense contractor, considered leaving the area. But Frederick Neuberger, a company vice president, studied the labor situation elsewhere without finding what the South Bronx offered, a "human reservoir of quality workers willing to start at minimum wage."

Another advantage, businessmen say, is the South Bronx's location. Herbert Klein, a director of mattress distributor Klein Sleep Products Inc., says he has seen other companies "offered everything from the Easter Bunny on down to move from the South Bronx," but he himself would never consider such a move.

#### TROUBLES STILL EXIST

"Forget the low-cost real estate and good work ethic of the people," Mr. Klein says. "What keeps my company in the South Bronx is being right smack in the middle of 20 million potential customers. I'm 12 minutes from Manhattan."

In the past 12 months, 134 companies have moved into or expanded in the South Bronx, more than the total for the previous 22 months. Yet the picture isn't all rosy. A New York Department of Labor "micro-area study" of the South Bronx puts unemployment at 14.8% as of June. And companies are still moving out. Electrical costs, crime and image problems continue to be major concerns.

Businesses are getting a break on New York City's electricity costs, among the highest in the nation. Consolidated Edison Co., the local utility, has started a program that saves new companies in the South Bronx as much as 25 percent on their bills. In recent months, about 90 businesses a month have applied to the program, up from 25 in the same period last year.

Leonard Fuchs, an executive vice president with M. Tucker Co., a food-equipment distributor moving to New Jersey, says crime was one reason his company decided to move out. "We were broken into two times in one weekend," he says.

But more police and more precautions, such as alarms and dogs, have driven the crime rate down. Lt. Nicholas DeChiaro of the 40th police precinct in the heart of the South Bronx, says statistics show that robberies and burglaries, the most common problems for businesses, are down by as much as 36 percent in recent months.

#### PERSISTENT IMAGE PROBLEM

Some workers still find the streets unsafe, however. "Of course coming to work is dangerous," says Robert Cummins, an employee of Guardsman Elevator Co. "Anything can happen," he adds. "You could be mugged, you could be killed, anything."

That sort of attitude goes along with the area's persistent image problem. American Banknote Co., which prints foreign currencies, has split itself up to accommodate the image. "What we've done," says Robert S. Ivie, vice president, "is keep our executive offices in Manhattan and just have the people on the production end" in the South Bronx. After all, he asks, "Would you want to work in a place where you could be robbed, where your car could be stripped?"

Bronx politicians have established forums at local colleges, a complaint hotline at Bronx borough hall and a chamber of commerce committee to help new businesses adjust to the area. Even New York Yankee



pitching ace Ron Guidry has been enlisted in the effort to make the South Bronx appeal to companies. Starting this fall, cards in city hotel rooms will inform tourists that they can call a number and hear the Cy Young Award winner describe all the "interesting things to do in the Bronx."

But that venture doesn't stir optimism in everyone. "Not many people are going to be coming up," says Donald DiMuro of the chamber of commerce. "You see," he adds, "it's like the rungs of a ladder—you go down one step at a time and you go up one step at a time. Right now we're just getting off the ground."●

## TELEPHONES FOR THE HEARING IMPAIRED

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased when the House overwhelmingly passed S. 2355, the Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982, on Monday. Upon enactment, this measure will prevent an ill-conceived Federal Communications Commission regulation from taking effect on January 1. This rule would have prevented State regulators from making specialized telephone equipment available to the disabled. This bill will insure that the hearing impaired have access to the telephone system of our Nation.

In our society, the telephone has become more than an integral way of life; it can mean the difference between life and death. This is particularly true for the elderly, who may often be homebound alone, and their only access to the outside world is via the telephone. One-third of Americans over 65 have hearing impairments which require the use of a hearing aid. S. 2355 will insure that newly manufactured telephones will be compatible with hearing aids. In addition, this measure encourages phone companies to provide specialized equipment at affordable prices to people with other physical disabilities. The immeasurable benefits which this legislation provides far outweigh the insignificant cost of this measure.●

## THE PEOPLE'S PARADISE

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, some form of socialism/communism is dominant in many nations and every continent. The idea of socialism is especially attractive to intellectuals who are able to maintain a comfortable distance from actual socialist practices.

Though socialism is a god that fails continuously, and causes more human

suffering and tragedy than any idea of practice in history, there are those who stubbornly cling to its high-minded idealism. They religiously close up their eyes to the reality that the socialist promise of instant utopia brings only the tyranny of a real dystopia.

It is for them that the following glimpse of reality is provided.

[From *Chronicles of Culture*, November 1982]

LETTER FROM PARIS: MITTERRAND'S FRANCE  
(By Thomas Molnar)

Since I have never traveled behind the Iron Curtain, I can only compare Mitterrand's France with socialist Burma, where Dictator-General Ne Win's heavy hand lies heavily even on tourists. France is not yet a Soviet-style state, but a few verbal snapshots can provide a picture of developments in summer 1982, after twelve months of the present regime.

The setting is in a new building, the office of a leftist-Catholic professor-editor. He has just finished writing his third semiclandestine (*samizdat*?) "letter to friends," calling on them to resist the ideologues who are demolishing the country economically and culturally. "In this office," he remarks with a wry smile, "we may still speak openly; as far as I know the walls have no microphones."

At France's border with Switzerland many travelers are stripped and searched in order to stop their fleeing francs from reaching the safe-deposit boxes of Swiss banks. Address books are photocopied by customs officials, later checked for names of friends whose monies you may be helping escape. A matchbox bearing the name of a Zurich bank can make one a suspect. Not only are the smaller fortunes fleeing (the big ones escape more officially as "transfers" or "investments"), but new investments—by Arabs, Japanese, Germans—are not forthcoming. One year's socialist-communist management has sufficed to make France's economic future bleak. I talked with young, enterprising businessmen, lawyers, scientists, all of whom contemplate emigration and spend their days devising ways and means to do so. Perhaps Mitterrand believed Pol Pot when he claimed that people are expendable and that one million hard communist Cambodians are enough for the country's future. During the summer, 2,000 gendarmes spread through France, checking for conformity to the postfreeze price of butter and eggs. Meanwhile, the minister of justice freed thousands of criminals after abolishing, through parliamentary majority, his predecessor's semitough law on security. Industries—the ones not yet bankrupt—are working halftime, while hopelessly struggling against worker demands encouraged by the government. Unemployment has risen beyond two million, and the number of those out of work continues to rise. Some expect that the communists might wait for more bitterness, then organize the unemployed into "worker-militias."

Is "communism" indeed Mitterrand's objective? He is known to be strongly against it. A close friend of his whom I queried said that the first adjective coming to his mind describing Mitterrand is *opportunist*. There may be no contradiction here; the four communists in the cabinet can scarcely do more damage than some of the socialist hierarchs, who are more Marxist than Marx. The whole picture recalls the Allende regime in Chile: fanatic, incompetent social-

ists trying to prove to their communist colleagues that Muscovite obedience is stilling—whereas socialists bring new techniques and strategies to the pink international. While Mitterrand is increasingly Buddha-like in his inscrutability, his minister of industry and technology, Jean-Pierre Chevènement, a man 20 years younger, emerges as the chief activist and ideologue. Again: is Chevènement a Marxist? The term is irrelevant, since "we are all Marxists now" and Chevènement represents simply a new, perhaps already international, Marxist activist model. Some 12 years ago, it is said, he wavered between leftist Gaullism and socialism; since then, he has fused the two and combined that explosive mixture with the utopian socialism (Engels *dixit*) of the French 1840's—Comte, Proudhon, but particularly Fourier. Chevènement's avowed goal—which he admits only in private—is a monolithic France, frugal and efficient, a model for the Third World. He brings to mind St. Just, the fiery young orator of the Revolution who narrowly missed stepping into Robespierre's shoes. Chevènement, whose ambition is limitless, regards himself as a stricter, less literary Mitterrand—and as a future president.

I love France, so I should not be suspected of deliberately painting a dark picture of the country. Voltaire's observation that "every man has two countries, his own and France" certainly applies to me. Thus I may close one eye when socialist leaders Quilès and Mermaz (the latter the speaker of the National Assembly) threaten the opposition with the line "heads will roll," or when moderate minister of economics Jacques Delors calls the opposition spokesmen "fascist loudmouths." But I am less tolerant with minister of culture Jack Lang, who ordered that on June 21, 22 and 23 (the summer solstice) France be turned over to "music and fun," with the result that screeching noise filled every arrondissement in Paris, and amateurish clowns stopped pedestrians at every corner. This is the socialist notion of "people's culture," while at the same time serious journalists—if they are critical of public policy—are denied newspaper, and television airs pornography and propaganda—or hour-long analyses of Mitterrand's books. To an unprejudiced eye, the officialization of fun has saturated France with a mood which is obviously morose. The abuses continue: unannounced strikes block vacationers at airports, company executives are sequestered in their offices, an old chateau is burned down by protesting workers. And the regime that once promised paradise now is already shopworn, fighting ridicule with threats instead of positive measures or competence. Even the small bourgeoisie—the country's backbone ever since the peasantry drastically diminished in numbers—is up in arms. But, unlike the summer of 1789, their anger is turned against the left, supposedly their official representative. From rich man to cafe waiter, they all exclaim: "Monsieur, cela ne va plus du tout, cela ne peut pas continuer!" What do they foresee? It is expected that the March 1983 municipal elections will clearly signify that the nation has had its fill of demagogic promises and catastrophic results. The regime is trying to meet this challenge by redistricting, most notably by fragmenting Paris (which, for a change, is now in an *anti-revolutionary* mood) into 20 independent—and socialist—fiefdoms. But the mayor of Paris, Jacques Chirac, is head of the opposition and a popular man. He asked the obvious question: why not divide Marseilles, too?

The mayor of Marseilles is E. Deferre, minister of interior; the issue was quickly shelved.

Mitterrand came to power largely on the implied promise that his would be a "socialism with a human face," the slogan of the Prague Spring and of the later vogue of Eurocommunism. Those who voted for him in 1981 have had a rude awakening and have yet to digest communist participation in important ministers. My feeling is that if Mitterrand, even now, dismissed the four communist cabinet ministers, popular opinion would turn in his favor. Much of the fled capital might also return. It may be worthwhile, therefore, to speculate on Mitterrand's motives in keeping them on. He obviously regards himself as a leftist de Gaulle, heir to the policy of an alternative to both Moscow and Washington. When he nationalized banks and other enterprises, he reasoned that "in the world of multinationalals the government must watch over the country's sovereignty." Next comes Mitterrand's conviction that France has for too long been a bourgeois country, and must regain a position of leadership among those who look toward a new revolution. This accounts for its aid to and rhetoric about Nicaragua and the like. It should not be forgotten that de Gaulle, too, tried to awaken national consciousness—and a "third option"—from Phnom Penh to Quebec. There is a greater continuity of French policies than meets the eye.

The most frightening aspect of Mitterrand's France is its egalitarian impulse. Igor Shafarevich theorized that socialism is the symptom of a nation's tiredness. I think that is a dangerous half-truth. Egalitarianism is a passion of envy and brutal ambition: in the end, it manipulates and reduces society to a geometrical pattern. A socialist society is not peaceful and passive but restless and combative. Most of the people I talked with in France were either cynical regarding the future ("plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose") or despairing. But there were others, too, new Jacobins with eyes ablaze at the prospects of drastic change. Chevenement is reputed to have suggested that all Frenchmen should think alike on issues of national and global import. His acolytes warn—so far, discreetly—intellectuals and professors that debates "in a critical vein," are not desirable. The consequence is, of course, that students spy on teachers, colleagues report colleagues, journalists, researchers and bankers look over their shoulders when talking, writing, deciding.

An often-heard adjective of Mitterrand's regime is "generous": a new and generous policy, a generous interpretation of the law, mistakes made out of generosity. Let us remember that while sending thousands to be "married to the guillotine," Robespierre had his mouth full of virtue.●

#### STATE OF OUR NATION

#### HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with the Members of the Congress an eloquent and articulate capsulization on the state of our Nation. The article which follows is reprinted from the Tuscola County Advertiser, a highly respected weekly newspaper

which serves a large rural portion of my district. It was written by Mr. Rudy Petzold, publisher and owner of the newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, I share this article with you because I was highly impressed, as I am sure you will be too, by the commitment and concern evidenced in this writing about the direction which our Nation is taking. This article truly captures a sense of what is going wrong in our country.

It calls for moderation from the White House and a return to the true basic American values such as compassion, realistic economic policies, fairness to the little guy, a lean, strong and credible national defense, protection for our elderly, and hope for all our youth. I could not agree more wholeheartedly.

This article reflects the unwavering commonsense of the American people. I think it merits the recognition of this Congress.

[From the Tuscola County (Mich.) Advertiser]

TRICKLE-UP

(By Rudy Petzold)

Mr. President . . . it's getting awfully tough for us out here to understand what you're trying to do up there.

Your "trickle down" supply side economics is turning into a major waterfall . . . and a lot of the ordinary folks that trusted and believed in you on election day are wondering whether you've lost your handle on things.

These people—and I was one of them—believed that you would bring sense and moderation to government. You talked sensibly. You talked with compassion. And those were the things that I believed necessary to gradually bring America out of the economic mess it has gotten itself into.

But as time goes on, I am having trouble believing you. And I am having great trouble in understanding your approach.

It took us 40 years to get into the mess we're in—we can't get out of it in less than 40 years. Both you and I are going to be dead and buried before the job is completed. This generation and its children simply cannot make up four generation's worth of free-wheeling.

In the last few weeks I've watched the television shows . . . hungry people, people living in tents, people seeing their little business fold, people suddenly left jobless and without hope. And even that would be bearable if everyone was feeling the bite.

But they aren't. The rich truly are getting richer. The poor are truly getting poorer. And those of us caught in the whipsaw of the middle-class which makes up the country's biggest segment, are feeling themselves sliding and sliding and sliding.

Most of the jobs in America are provided by the middle class that is being destroyed. Most of the taxes that are used to build schools and roads, support churches and charities, build towns and maintain them—come from the middle class that your "trickle down" theory is now destroying.

Instead of building new production facilities and expanding the hard production capabilities of America—the rich are gobbling each other up in endless mergers and takeovers. They sit at their corporate tables playing gargantuan "Monopoly games" and

the little people who built their pyramids and palaces matter not one iota. Only the "bottom line" matters to them—to hell with the people that create the bottom line.

You brag about inflation being brought under control. Yes, the inflation in the private sector is slowing—but what about the tax hogs of the government? The property tax on my home went up 30% in one year. The property taxes on my business went up 20% in one year. And these increases are at a time when no one wants to buy them, or could afford to buy them. The tax is even higher when related to the declining value both homes and businesses represent in these times.

This "trickle down" business surely has not trickled down to county, township and school tax collectors who have just blasted us with another horrendous tax increase in dollar terms. And still they do not have enough money.

Your paranoia about national defense is disturbing. The MX and the other toys of destruction that the military keeps on wanting are sucking billions and billions of little people's dollars into the cesspool of military extravagance. We need a defense to save us from defense.

This nation has to be strong—but you've got the wrong idea about what strong means. Strength is not determined by the number of swords, but by the will, who wield them. Your bull-headed refusal to back down on the extravagance of military spending destroys a lot of credibility and it disgusts me.

What will the horrible force of destruction defend—if America itself is gutted by the rich and left in economic disaster by bull-headed refusals to moderate the long-term job of reconstruction and rebuilding of our nation's economic strength.

Our business is having the worst times since the depression. We are flowing in red ink. But at least we can still afford the red ink. My heart goes out to the millions of little people, young people, elderly and hope-shattered people who are seeing what little they have evaporate and who are left with the feeling that this land is now run in the interests of the wealthy who live like fat and uncaring pharaohs off the slaves out in the brick pits.

You want to move the tax cut up from July to January 1983. Do it—but divert the entire tax cut to people who make \$25,000 a year or less and exempt everyone whose income tops that. We don't need any more "trickle down" . . . we need some "trickle up."

Give the benefits, the money, the breaks to the little guys—there are millions of them. They will begin spending the benefits, the breaks and the money because they have to survive. Giving them to the rich just sends more gold to their vaults and gives them more chips to play with in their games of corporate wheeling-dealing.

Mr. President, we cannot rebuild America in just four years. We desperately need a strong dose of moderation, the kind of moderation that most of us Americans who voted for you thought we would be getting.●



# WESTERN HEMISPHERE CONFERENCE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS ON POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, at your direction, the Honorable JOHN E. PORTER, of Illinois, and I attended the recent Western Hemisphere Conference of Parliamentarians on Population and Development in Brasilia, Brazil, from December 2 to 5.

This conference followed a world conference held in Sri Lanka in 1979 and the earlier world conference in Bucharest in 1974. Delegates from 20 Western Hemisphere countries concluded the conference with a unanimous declaration including the following key recommendation calling on parliamentarians of the Western Hemisphere to:

Establish National Committees of Parliamentarians on Population and Development which can:

Increase understanding among parliamentarians of the interrelationship between population and development.

Promote a dialog between parliamentarians and social, economic, and population planners and administrators.

Review, propose, and modify—according to the needs of each country—legislation that relates to population and development.

Insure that all individuals can exercise their basic right to decide freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children, by providing family planning information and services. Family planning services must be voluntary and be provided in ways that respect human dignity, individual rights, and spiritual values.

Include parliamentarians in official delegations to the United Nations and other conferences, particularly the United Nations Population Conference to be held in Mexico City in 1984.

A copy of the unanimous declaration of the conference is attached:

DECLARATION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE CONFERENCE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS ON POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT BRASILIA, DIGEST, DECEMBER 5, 1982

We, the parliamentarians attending the first Conference of the Western Hemisphere Conference of Parliamentarians on Population and Development

Wish to express our sincere gratitude to the government and people of Brazil for their generosity in hosting this historic conference.

The beauty of this unique city of Brasilia is exceeded only by the gracious hospitality of its people and its parliamentarians.

We record our appreciation of the honour of having had his Excellency Aureliano Chaves, the Vice-President, and the Honorable Nelson Marchezan, President of the

Chamber of Deputies, perform the opening ceremony of the Conference.

We also record our conviction that the full success of the Conference is due in great part of the magnificent efforts of the Brazilian Parliamentarian Group for the Study of Population and Development and the Brazilian Society for Family Welfare in Brazil, Brazil. To them we express our thanks.

## PREAMBLE

1. We, parliamentarians from 22 countries of the western hemisphere attending the first Western Hemisphere Conference of Parliamentarians on Population and Development, held in Brasilia December 2-5, 1982, having considered the development implications of population dynamics, migration and urbanization, the status of women, and the protection of children:

2. Consider that the goals of development policies as well as population policies are to improve the quality of human life, and the population and development variables are closely linked. Effective development planning cannot be done without considering population phenomena. Likewise, population factors must be harmonized with other elements of development effort.

3. Acknowledge that development is a complex process which involves many aspects of social, political, economic, and cultural change. Different countries have chosen different paths toward development. Population and development policies must respect the social, cultural, and political characteristics of each country and of each ethnic group within the country. Achievement of meaningful social and economic development implies a fairer distribution of goods and resources within countries and among countries.

4. Recognize that the nations of this hemisphere have accumulated a substantial social debt to their citizens, as indicated by the millions who are without adequate housing, education, health care, nutrition, and employment opportunities.

## THE CURRENT SITUATION OF THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

### Population and development

5. The 1982 population of the Western Hemisphere is estimated to be 634 million, composed as follows: Latin America—348 million; Caribbean—30 million; U.S. and Canada—256 million. Although rates of population growth have decreased throughout the hemisphere, tremendous demographic momentum remains. In Latin America and the Caribbean the population is projected to double by the year 2005. This means that by the year 2005, development planners must devise ways to feed, house, educate, employ, and provide other basic services to a new population as large as that which inhabits the region today.

6. Although considerable economic and social progress has been made over the past decade, serious problems of economic growth and distribution of resources persist. Among countries in the region, there is a wide disparity in indicators of development such as per capita income, literacy nutritional status, and life expectancy. Economic growth, which increased rapidly during the 1960s has slowed during the 1970s. Prices for raw materials produced in the region have remained low while the cost of importing manufactured goods from the industrialized nations has continued to increase. Inflation has reached 100 percent annually in some countries of the hemisphere.

7. Rapid population growth threatens to deplete natural resources and to outpace im-

provements in food production. It also seems sure to increase the already high levels of unemployment in the Western Hemisphere, since many countries would have to double their 1950-1980 rate of economic growth to generate enough jobs to absorb those who will be entering the labor force.

### Migration and urbanization

8. More than 60 percent of the population lives in urban areas. In Latin America, urban migration has grown at more than 5 percent a year and urban population will almost double from now to the year 2005. This rapid urbanization will continue to generate acute problems. Many major cities in the region are characterized by shantytowns surrounding the "downtown" areas, inhabited by people who live without adequate shelter, sanitation, water and other basic services. The situation is further complicated by high rates of urban unemployment and underemployment in some countries which generate international migration, which is difficult to regulate. In many ways, the region is fast becoming a regional labor market, regardless of immigration laws. The migration of undocumented workers has become an important economic, social, human and political issue in both countries of origin and destination.

### The status of women

9. Women have not attained rights equal to men in some countries of the western hemisphere. This inequality is manifested in either de jure or de facto discrimination in employment, education, family rights, and political rights. In some countries married women cannot hold property, receive credit, or inherit property in their own names, and even the basic right to regulate fertility does not exist in many countries. The ability of women to plan, manage and control their own fertility is a pre-requisite to equality.

### The protection of children

10. Children represent the future of our countries, consequently the problems of children in this hemisphere must be of great concern and high priority. Infant mortality remains high, and in some areas one out of every 10 children born die before reaching their first birthday. Although there are wide variations between and even within countries, more than 3000 small children die every day in Latin America and the Caribbean. Deaths of young children could be reduced dramatically utilizing preventive medicine which is currently available. The abandoned child constitutes a most painful social reality in our countries. Behind every abandoned child there is an abandoned family of an unwanted pregnancy. The abandonment, if not addressed, leads to anti-social behaviour. The prevention of abandonment requires policies of economic, social, educational, cultural and moral reinforcement of the family. Assistance to the abandoned child should be provided within the family whenever possible, or in a substitute family, be it by adoption of by foster parents, and only as a last resort by institutionalization.

### OBJECTIVES

11. In view of the concerns and challenges describes above, the Conference addressed itself to the following objectives:

To promote cooperation and collaboration among parliamentarians of the Western Hemisphere \* \* \*

To improve the quality of life of the people of the Western Hemisphere, by pro-

moting equitable and rational population and development policies.

To encourage the adoption of legislation which will rationalize internal and international migration policies, improve the status of women, and provide greater protection to children.

#### A CALL

12. To achieve these objectives, the Conference calls on:

Parliaments of the region to:

Establish National Committees of Parliamentarians on Population and Development which can:

Increase understanding among parliamentarians of the inter-relationship between population and development.

Promote a dialogue between parliamentarians and social, economic, and population planners and administrators.

Review, propose, and modify—according to the needs of each country—legislation that relates to population and development.

Government of the region to:

#### POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT

13. Strengthen and expand socio-economic development programs and ensure that development is directed toward reducing social and economic disparities, thus helping to build more equitable societies.

Ensure that all individuals can exercise their basic right to decide freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children, by providing family planning information and services. Family planning services must be voluntary and be provided in ways that respect human dignity, individual rights and spiritual values.

Include parliamentarians in official delegations to the United Nations and other conferences, particularly the United Nations Population Conference to be held in Mexico City in 1984.

Establish National Population Councils which can serve as a focal point for the initiation and co-ordination of population and development policies.

#### MIGRATION

14. Encourage more balance growth by formulating national and regional development plans which promote the growth of smaller and intermediate sized cities and give priority to development of rural areas.

Improve the quality of life in marginal urban settlements by adopting policies designed to solve the problem and, in any event, to provide basic social services.

Support the efforts of the United Nations to conclude an international treaty on international migrant workers, and in the meantime, encourage both origin and destination countries to negotiate bilateral or multilateral agreements in respect of international migration.

#### THE STATUS OF WOMEN

15. Guarantee full equality of women and men under the law and in actual practice. To ensure such equality, family codes, employment laws, and other legislation should be examined and those which discriminate against women or men should be modified. Where appropriate, equality between men and women should be guaranteed by the constitution of each nation.

16. Emphasize in primary health care programs, services for women, including family planning information and services as well as care for pregnant women and lactating mothers.

#### THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN

17. Give high priority to those health interventions which can save children's lives

and protect their health. Among these are: family planning, immunization, oral rehydration therapy; also implement the recommendation of WHO concerning breast feeding.

18. Improve the social and economic conditions which provide a basis for the welfare of children, particularly, housing, nutrition, sanitation, domestic water supply, primary education, recreation and strengthening family structure.

19. Develop programs to reduce the incidence of adolescent pregnancy.

20. Support the Inter American Institute of the Child in its programs to improve and modernize birth registration and adoption procedures.

Governments of the world to:

21. Increase the overall amount of development assistance and, in particular, to increase the allocation of international assistance to social programs including population programs. The Conference reiterates the United Nations recommendation that the governments of the developed nations devote at least 1 percent of their gross national product to development assistance, and reaffirms the call of the Colombo Declaration on Population and Development to achieve an annual target of one billion dollars for population assistance in 1984.

Development banks, intergovernmental agencies, and nongovernmental organizations to:

22. Increase their financial support for government and nonorganizations in the countries of the Western Hemisphere, in order to sustain and expand projects and programs in population and development.

23. Support the organization of similar conferences in the Western Hemisphere region at least once every three years; and also to support a World Conference of Parliamentarians on Population and Development in 1984.

24. Support the establishment of national committees of Parliamentarians on Population and Development and a regional Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development which will promote the activities of parliamentarians in the countries of the region and will coordinate the exchange and dissemination of experiences of the various national committees.

#### COMMITMENT

25. We, the Parliamentarians at this Conference, in our capacities as legislators, representatives of our people, and leaders of the community, commit ourselves to:

Create national awareness and understanding of the relationships between population and development particularly among parliamentarians in our own countries.

26. Promote the formation of national committees of Parliamentarians on Population and Development, and participating fully in their activities.

27. Request the Steering Committee of this Western Hemisphere Conference to co-ordinate the actions of Parliamentarians on Population and Development in the Western Hemisphere region; and urge it to maintain close contact and cooperation with the UNDP, UNFPA, IPPF, OAS, UNICEF, WHO, World Bank and other relevant organizations.

28. Encourage the passage of legislation necessary to improve the status of women, to provide better protection for children, to rationalize patterns of migration both within and among countries, and to integrate population considerations into development planning.

29. Finally we commit ourselves to initiating and pursuing the actions required to re-

alize the aims and objectives of this Declaration of Brasilia.●

## INDICTMENT OF CUBAN OFFICIALS FOR NARCOTICS SMUGGLING

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of our colleagues a recent development in the continuing fight against illegal narcotics trafficking. Last month a Federal grand jury in Miami handed down indictments against 14 individuals—including four high-level Cuban Government officials—for involvement in the international narcotics trade.

These indictments mark a welcome, forceful step in the struggle by the United States against the international drug scourge. For the benefit of our colleagues, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point two informative articles from the New York Times and the Washington Post.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 6, 1982]

U.S. DRUG CHARGES CITE FOUR CUBAN AIDES  
TEN OTHER MEN INDICTED IN MIAMI IN LARGE-SCALE SMUGGLING

(By George Volsky)

MIAMI.—Four high-ranking Cuban officials, including the chief of the Cuban Navy, were among 14 people indicted here today on Federal charges of smuggling narcotics into the United States.

Stanley Marcus, United States Attorney for the Southern District of Florida, who announced the indictment, said he believed this was the first time an official of the Government of President Fidel Castro of Cuba had been charged with such offenses. He said the indictment was strictly a criminal matter and was not a foreign policy maneuver.

A Cuban official in Washington said today that the charges against the four Cubans were "all lies." There was no immediate comment from Havana.

#### BASED ON 3-YEAR INVESTIGATION

While officials here would not comment for the record, the indictment was preceded by a three-year investigation by agents of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

Peter F. Gruden, head of the agency's Miami office, said the case "is important in view of the substantial amount of drugs involved." According to the indictment, more than 5 million methaqualone tablets and more than 1,000 pounds of marijuana were smuggled into Florida in two separate operations between the fall of 1979 and January 1981.

Mr. Gruden said the four Cubans indicted are presumably in Cuba. It was considered unlikely that the four would come to the United States to face trial.

Eight of the 10 others indicted, mostly Cuban-Americans, were reported in Federal custody.

Before this year Cuban officials have not been linked to drug trafficking. But in April



Thomas O. Enders, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, said the United States had evidence that Cuban intelligence authorities were using drug trafficking as a guise for running guns to guerrillas in Latin America.

The Cubans indicted were:

Vice Adm. Aldo Santamaria Cuadrado, who is also a member of the Central Committee of the ruling Communist Party of Cuba;

René Rodríguez Cruz, another Central Committee member, who is president of the Cuban Institute of Friendship with the Peoples, the government agency that coordinates activities of foreigners visiting Cuba;

Fernando Ravelo Renedo, who used to be Cuba's Ambassador in Bogotá, Colombia, and who is now a high official in the Foreign Ministry;

Gonzalo Bassols Suárez, minister-counselor in the Bogotá Embassy at the time of the activities charged in the indictment.

One of those indicted, Jaime Guillot Lara, a Colombian, is reputed to be an international drug trafficker, and his whereabouts are unknown. He was arrested several months ago in Mexico, charged with smuggling. He is also wanted by Colombia, where he has been accused of smuggling arms from Cuba for Colombian leftist guerrillas. But late last month he was released by Mexican authorities and left Mexico City for Spain, from which he traveled to an unknown destination.

#### NINE CUBAN-AMERICANS CHARGED

The nine others indicted, all Cuban-born Americans, were David Lorenzo Pérez Jr., Hector Gonzalez Quinones, Jorge Felipe Llerena Delgado, Jose Domingo Martinez Valdes, Jose Rafael Martinez, Cornelio Ramos Valladares, Alberto Cortes, Levinio Orobio Michelena and Julian Losada.

Of the nine Cuban-Americans, only Mr. Losada is at large, according to Mr. Gruen. The indictment asserts that the 14 conspired "to commit certain offenses against the United States." Part of the conspiracy was purportedly an agreement between Ambassador Ravelo, Mr. Bassols, Mr. Rodriguez Cruz, Mr. Guillot and others to "use Cuba as a loading station and source of supplies for ships transporting methaqualone tablets and marijuana from Colombia to the southern district of Florida, by way of Cuba."

According to the eight-count indictment, Admiral Santamaria and others "would supervise, in Cuba, the protection and resupply of ships transporting methaqualone tablets and marijuana" from Colombia to the United States.

Admiral Santamaria and Mr. Rodriguez Cruz are known to be close friends of President Castro. Both belong to a small group that was the core of the guerrilla movement under Mr. Castro that overthrew the dictatorship of President Fulgencio Batista in 1959.

A State Department source said today that the Justice Department had discussed the case with the State Department before obtaining the indictments. Another State Department official said he could not say whether Washington had been in touch with Havana about the case.

Mr. Marcus also said that once criminal charges were filed against an individual, he could be arrested at any time. "The U.S. may be able to apprehend them in another country," he said.

In response to the indictment of the four Cuban officials, Miguel Martinez, the press officer of the Cuban Interest Section in Washington, which handles Cuban affairs

in the absence of an embassy, said today: "It is all lies. There is not a single truth in those allegations and that's that."

Asked to discuss the indictments further, Mr. Martinez said, "We are not going to elaborate."

In a telephone interview, Mr. Marcus, the United States Attorney, said the indictment of the Cuban officials simply represented the "application of American law by the grand jury" and was in no way a foreign policy maneuver. "I'm not involved with foreign policy," he said.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 6, 1982]

#### FOUR CUBAN OFFICIALS INDICTED IN DRUG SMUGGLING

HAVANA SAID HAVEN FOR COLOMBIA GOODS

(By Mary Thornton)

Two members of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee and two other high-level Cuban officials were among 14 persons indicted yesterday by a federal grand jury in Miami on charges of conspiring to import marijuana and methaqualone from Colombia to the United States by way of Cuba.

The Cuban officials were charged with allowing Cuba to be used "as a loading station and source of supplies" for drug smugglers bringing drugs from Colombia to the United States from 1978 until April of this year.

The indictments marked the first time that Cuban officials have been formally accused of drug trafficking, although there have been widespread reports that the Castro government was heavily involved in smuggling drugs from Colombia to the United States via the communist island nation.

The Reagan administration announced last month that it intended to get tough on drug traffickers by setting up 12 regional task forces covering the country with 1,200 new agents and prosecutors.

Drug Enforcement Administration officials said yesterday that they decided to seek indictments against the Cuban officials to draw attention to the role of the Castro government in drug trafficking in the Americas. Sources said there is little hope of prosecuting the Cubans, since the United States does not maintain diplomatic relations with Cuba.

Jim Judge, a DEA spokesman, said the indictments followed a three-year investigation. During that period, he said, Colombians brought into this country 2.5 million pounds of marijuana, 23 million methaqualone tablets, known as Quaaludes, and 80 pounds of cocaine. Those drugs would have a street value of more than \$800 million, officials said. Much of the marijuana and methaqualone came through Cuba.

A DEA source alleged that the smugglers were led by a Colombian named Jaime Guillot-Lara, also indicted yesterday, who is accused of paying off Cuban officials so that his boats could stop at Cuban ports for supplies and refueling.

In return, the source said, Guillot-Lara was allegedly paid by Cuban officials to smuggle arms to the M19 leftist guerrilla movement in Colombia. One of his boats was seized by the Colombian government in 1981 with 100 tons of weapons aboard.

Guillot-Lara was wanted by U.S. authorities for a 1978 drug indictment and by Colombian authorities on weapons charges. He was arrested last year in Mexico City and charged with being involved in terrorist activities. But Mexican authorities released him last month. He fled to Spain and is believed to be in hiding in Europe.

The Justice Department has sent a formal protest to the Mexican government over his release.

A DEA source said that all of the boats allegedly used in the operation were renamed "Viviana" and that the Cuban navy was under orders not to fire upon any boat bearing that name.

The Cuban officials named in the indictment include:

Rene Rodriguez-Cruz, reportedly an official of the Cuban intelligence service, member of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee and president of the Cuban Institute of Friendship with the Peoples. It was in the last capacity in 1980 that Rodriguez helped organize the boatlift of nearly 125,000 Cubans to the United States as refugees—including some convicts from Cuban jails.

Aldo Santamaria-Cuadrado, also known as Rene Baeza-Rodriguez, who the indictment identifies as a vice admiral in the Cuban navy and a member of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee. He "would supervise in Cuba the protection and resupply of ships transporting marijuana from Colombia to the United States by way of Cuba," the indictment says.

Fernando Ravelo-Renedo, Cuban ambassador to Colombia until the embassy in Bogotá was closed as relations between the countries worsened in 1980. He is godfather of a 2-year-old daughter of Colombian drug trafficker Juan (Johnny) Crump. Crump is now in the federal witness protection program.

Gonzalo Bassols-Suarez, identified as a former minister-counselor of the Cuban embassy in Bogotá and a member of the Cuban Communist Party.

A DEA source said that Rodriguez-Cruz and Santamaria-Cuadrado are both close associates of Cuban President Fidel Castro.

Two of the men indicted were arrested yesterday in Miami. They were Cubans Jose Domingo-Martinez and Alberto Cortes.

Others indicted include five Cubans who are already serving time in American prisons on drug charges: Cornelio Ramos-Valladares, David Lorenzo-Perez, Jorge Felipe Llerena-Delgado, Jose Rafael Martinez and Hector Gonzales. A Colombian named in the indictments, Levinio Orobio-Michelena, is also in a U.S. prison on drug charges.

Another indictment listed charges against Julian Losada, who is still in Colombia. ●

#### RAILROAD RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which addressed the serious financial problems currently facing the railroad retirement system. As a result of the serious recession this Nation is now in, employment in the railroad industry has dropped by 70,000 in the last year and a half—a decrease far in excess of what anyone could have predicted. This decrease in employment has, in turn, resulted in decreased payroll tax revenues to the railroad retirement system.

Under section 22 of the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Board has the authority to reduce benefit payments if, in a particular fiscal year, the Board projects there will be insufficient funds to pay full benefits. As a result of the recent large reductions in railroad employment—and thus payroll tax revenues—caused by the current recession, it is possible that there will be a cash shortfall in fiscal year 1984, absent corrective action. As a result, the Board may face the need to reduce benefits in fiscal year 1984.

Of course, Congress will do its utmost to prevent that from happening. I expect that rail labor and management will come to a prompt agreement on recommendations to solve the financial problems facing railroad retirement and that Congress can act on those recommendations early in 1983. But—let me make this clear—if no agreement is reached promptly, Congress will not sit idly by and let benefits be cut. I am particularly concerned that rail management may believe that no action is necessary at this time, since under the law, benefits are cut automatically if there is a cash shortfall. As the introduction of this legislation should show, Congress will not let that happen.

However, if the Board is faced with a financial crisis, its sole option at the present time is to reduce benefits. This is grossly unfair to railroad retirees. To remedy this inequity, this bill would amend section 22 of the Railroad Retirement Act to require the Board to raise taxes at the same time that it reduces benefits, if it is ever forced to take such emergency action. Under this bill, the tier II—or private pension component—payroll tax paid by employers would automatically increase by 3 percent and the tier II payroll tax paid by employees would automatically increase by 1.5 percent, simultaneously with any reduction in benefits.

This would result in greater equity, as all parties—including the carriers—would have to share the burden. In addition, the increased taxes would add revenue to the system, minimizing any benefit cuts that would be required. While it is my expectation such emergency action will never take place, it is clear that if it ever does, it is most unfair and inequitable to have railroad retirees bear the full burden of a cash shortfall beyond their control.

While this bill would make any emergency action more equitable, we must avoid the need to take the sort of emergency action contemplated by section 22. Thus, I urge rail labor and management to promptly submit joint recommendations to Congress which address the financial problems of the railroad retirement system.●

## SOME COMMONSENSE FROM LLOYD MCBRIDE

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, this week United Steelworkers of America President Lloyd McBride appeared before the Congressional Steel Caucus. His testimony was an excellent presentation of problems facing the steelworkers, and in particular how the TRA program has been cut back to the point where it has been destroyed.

Mr. McBride began with a very concise overview of the steel situation facing our Nation.

The American steel industry and its employees are locked in an economic depression unlike anything since the 1930s. The outlook for the immediate future is bleak and no one has any idea of when or how the steel industry will recover. Many of our members—some 120,000—are facing economic disaster . . . Another fact that you already know is that at a time when our industry is operating at below 40 percent capacity, steel imports are approaching record highs, averaging 22.4 percent of our market which is about 25 percent higher than last year.

Mr. McBride moved from there to look at the cutbacks in the TRA program and how that has adversely affected the steelworkers across the United States. Mr. McBride noted that "TRA was based on the idea that workers who were injured because of liberalized international trade policies should receive special consideration in an effort to help them adjust to changing trade patterns," but went on to conclude "for all practical purposes those special considerations and, in fact, the whole notion underlying TRA have been largely eliminated."

Mr. McBride outlined that since late 1981, the union has filed TRA petitions covering 93 steelmaking facilities. The scoreboard since then shows: 2 cases certified by the Labor Department plus 2 partial certifications; 7 petitions have been denied; 84 petitions remain pending, some for as long as 14 months.

Mr. McBride concluded that:

The combination of adverse administrative actions and legislative cuts have all but eliminated TRA as a viable program for workers subject to trade-related unemployment.

He added these recommendations:

First, review the criteria used by the Labor Department in determining TRA certification in order to identify and correct any flaws in that criteria. At the very least the Labor Department should be requested to review its criteria and methods in light of existing circumstances and steel import levels;

Second, examine the Labor Department's long lag time in making a determination on TRA certification; and

Third, address the question of should we have a trade adjustment assistance program or not. This would involve a series of hearings and investigations that could contribute to any final decision on the TRA program which is scheduled to expire in September, 1983.

I have talked to many steelworkers in the area I represent who are frustrated by this inaction in the TRA program. I believe we need a strong, active TRA program and will certainly be working for that goal in the coming Congress.●

## OUR FEDERAL BUDGET: A CALL TO ACTION

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, Robert D. Kilpatrick's speech of December 8, entitled "Our Federal Budget: A Call To Action," merits careful consideration. Mr. Kilpatrick points to the dangers to our economy if we do not control Federal spending and reduce the staggering deficits that we face if we leave the Federal budget on automatic pilot.

Mr. Kilpatrick believes, as I do, that "Americans are willing to do their fair share, to sacrifice if others do, to tighten up if it is done as part of a program to strengthen the Nation." I have called for a national needs budget that would encompass some of the recommendations made by Mr. Kilpatrick. I hope my colleagues will read Mr. Kilpatrick's speech because I think it represents a substantial concern that the business community, in particular, and the American people in general have with the need for a sound and effective fiscal policy that will promote economic growth.

### OUR FEDERAL BUDGET: A CALL TO ACTION

(By Robert D. Kilpatrick, President and Chief Executive Officer, CIGNA Corp.)

I very much appreciate the invitation to join you this evening. I know that every visitor who comes to Washington has heard more than his fair share of economics speeches. Therefore, I shall try to be as brief and direct as I can be.

I want to underscore my strong support for the work you are discussing. This conference comes at an important time for me, for the Business Roundtable, and for my company, CIGNA Corporation. If all of the construction industry cost effectiveness recommendations are addressed, savings of \$10 billion a year could be achieved. That means that you've got your eye on the ball. Those kinds of savings are of particular interest to folks like me who are involved in financing and insuring much of the construction of this nation. My company, CIGNA, is very much involved in the development of your business. And indeed we are currently building over one million square feet of new office space for our own use. My own experience is an example of why the Chief Executive Officers of the Business Roundtable are



fully committed to and supportive of the CICE project and objectives.

More important, your business is fundamental to the growth of the nation's economy. We can take some modest pleasure that spending on new construction rose 1.1 percent in October, the biggest gain since June. Some of the other indicators are also beginning to point upwards.

So, there may be some light at the end of the tunnel. Our problem is to make sure it's not merely the headlight of a train coming the other way.

What do I mean? Simply this. The long-term health of the construction business, the financial services and investment businesses, and of the entire nation depends on the vitality of private capital-raising and investment activity. Yet our national fiscal and monetary policies over the past decade have not been adequately inductive to capital formation.

The problem is clear. We have for many months endured a severe recession. We are showing early signs of recovery. But the federal budget continues to be out of control. We can't afford to carry government spending and debt at these levels and have the needed resources left to restore the private sector of our economy. At current and projected levels of federal budget deficit—\$175 billion in Fiscal Year 1983 and over \$200 billion in Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985—the resources of our country won't be committed to increases in productivity. In 1974 the federal deficit was only \$6 billion, the closest to a balanced budget in the last decade. When compared to the total spending that year the deficit was four-tenths of one percent of the Gross National Product. During the Fiscal Year that just ended, the deficit was \$110 billion and four percent of the GNP. This is a tenfold increase since 1974. At this rate, we will be trapped by servicing the highest debt levels in our history.

I recently attended a meeting with the President at which Martin Feldstein, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, reported that federal borrowing needed to service these deficits would soak up 75 percent of all private savings. I don't need to tell you what that would do to the cost and availability of investment funds for business, especially your business. Every dollar that the Federal Treasury borrows is a dollar that is not being spent on new plant and equipment, money that is not available to put people to work. There would be real crowding out of private investment, just at the time the economy is trying to begin a sustained recovery. That's the train coming the other way.

The private sector simply cannot sustain such a distortion in federal taxing and spending. When the cost effectiveness study was initiated four years ago, how many of you would have contemplated federal spending in excess of \$2 billion a day? In the 1984 fiscal year we will edge close to our first trillion dollar budget. Since 1975, federal spending has more than doubled and is consuming a larger portion of the GNP.

Let me give you a snapshot of the federal budget. The automatically appropriated entitlement programs—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, Veterans' Benefits, Food Stamps—when added to contracts that the federal government has become obligated for, amount to 45 percent of the budget. Social Security alone—the largest single entitlement—amounts to 23 percent of the budget.

The second category is national defense. Defense spending accounts for 29 percent of

the budget. Add the 14 percent of the budget which is the necessary interest to pay for the debt, and we find that a staggering 88 percent of our three-quarters of a trillion dollar federal budget is in the so-called "untouchable" area.

These so-called uncontrollables or sacred cows cannot be sacred any more. We simply will never see another balanced budget without reductions in the planned increases for defense and Social Security which are each scheduled to exceed \$1 trillion over the next five years. We simply do not have enough discretionary programs with room left to be cut.

I have described this composition of our budget to make a basic point. The federal budget is virtually on automatic pilot, and it's headed toward disaster. The problem is not just restraining spending. It's worse than that. The problem is cutting back on the pre-programmed spending which already consumes 88 percent of the budget, is growing steadily, and will require positive action to be brought under control. There are some obvious solutions, and I will discuss them briefly. Our difficulty is not in recognizing what must be done, but in putting our national interest above the political difficulty of taking the action needed.

For a Senator or a Congressman or a business leader to recommend changes in entitlements or defense or revenues is to invite harsh criticism. That's understandable. People fear changes in entitlements, our defense is vital to our security, and we are already taxed heavily. The point is that there is a greater danger than inaction, and that is the crippling effect of triple digit deficits. We have to discuss the national interest in the face of such a threat. I believe the President is the best defender of our national interest and the single person best suited to take unpopular steps for the country's interest.

I strongly believe that Americans are willing to do their fair share, to sacrifice if others do, to tighten up if it's done as part of a program to strengthen the nation. The President will find that the American people prefer strong leadership with bad news but a way to solve the problem. I think a major television address describing the dimensions of the serious crisis we face would produce political support for the President's efforts.

What must be done? The answer is everything! This means a balanced economic package which takes something from all of us and to which we all contribute.

Further reductions in spending must be the first priority. I realize that Congress and the Administration have teamed up during the past two years to begin to turn back the spending patterns of the last twenty years. But we simply have not gone far enough, as our triple digit deficit makes clear. And some dubious reductions, through such practices as overestimating management savings or tax receipts, or by shifting costs between sectors, are not the answer. Tough program reductions on an across-the-board basis, with no area of the budget being held sacrosanct, are what is needed.

Take Social Security, for example. Benefit growth has grown dramatically in recent years. In 1970, Social Security expenditures were \$34 billion and consumed 17 percent of the federal budget. Today those costs are \$172 billion, and they absorb over 20 percent of the budget. Unless growth is slowed, it is projected that Social Security costs will total \$400 billion by the end of this decade.

To pay for these benefits, workers and employers have been forced to shoulder an incredible weight. In 1970, the maximum possible tax on a worker was \$374. Today, it is \$2,170 and by the end of the decade it will be almost \$8,000. As we so well know, this tells only half the story because each employee dollar is matched by one from business.

Even though some individuals pay more Social Security taxes than federal income taxes and even though Social Security taxes are adding weight to business's burden during a time of record business failures, the Social Security system is going broke. Actuaries predict that the retirement fund will require an additional \$75-200 billion over the next five years. And the picture for the long-term is even bleaker. Where five workers are barely able to support one today, only two-and-one-half workers will be around to pay for each beneficiary in forty years.

Let me deal candidly with the element of fear in discussing Social Security. We are not talking about cutting benefits. We are talking about preserving the Social Security system so that current beneficiaries receive their checks. And we are talking about the changes necessary to ensure that today's young people have a solid system intact for their retirement. That basic security is essential. We cannot have it if we continue to expand without control. We will have to grow more slowly. We will have to restrict the rate of increase in benefits. We must do this to save a system which faces bankruptcy. The American people, I am sure, will choose a healthy Social Security system expanding more gradually to one on the rocks which threatens our future security. That's the hard truth, but if we face it we can protect both our elderly and our youth.

The other large area of federal spending is defense. Defense is the single most important part of our budget. It's the one category we can honestly say must come first, because without a strong national defense in this world all else is threatened. But national security also requires a strong national economy, and our economy is threatened by the crushing weight of our deficits.

Current budget requests call for defense spending to double by 1987 when it will consume 31 percent of the federal budget and 9 percent of GNP. While I support a strong defense I also underscore that our federal budget cannot admit any sacred cows. Unless we change the projected growth in defense spending it will grow twice as fast as all other federal spending during the next five years. I know that we can remain strong and yet grow more slowly. As part of a fair package of budget reform, defense must be included.

Slowing the growth of entitlement programs and defense spending simply cannot be avoided—I repeat, cannot be avoided.

As I observed, entitlements, defense, and interest on the debt amount to over three-fourths of the federal budget. There just is not enough room in the rest of the budget for significant spending cuts which will reduce the deficit. Let me give you an example. You are well aware of the Administration's aggressive campaign to curtail waste, fraud, and abuse. The Administration now calculates that its effort has saved \$8 billion—an impressive achievement, but not much of a dent in a \$175 billion deficit. If we continue to concentrate on only non-defense and non-entitlement spending, whole programs and departments will have to be eliminated, including education, conserva-

tion, housing assistance, road construction and foreign aid. I think you will agree that this is a fruitless endeavor. If there is one message I want you to take away this evening, it is that entitlements and defense spending must be subjected to the same budget discipline that has already been visited upon the discretionary parts of the budget.

Finally, let me talk about taxes. Business strongly supported the steps taken by the Administration and Congress to spur investment, savings and capital formation in 1981 even though we thought further business tax incentives could have been added. Many in the business community also reluctantly lined up behind the President earlier this year in support of the 1982 tax bill as a means to reduce the projected budget deficit below a \$100 billion threshold, even though many viewed the legislation as a retreat. I personally do not think further tax increases are the answer. Additional taxes on business will only serve to deter our economic recovery and future growth. Spending cuts must be the first priority. Yet in the vein of common sacrifices for the national good, revenues may have to be part of a general package designed to attack the deficits.

The bottom line of my message to you tonight is a call to action—a call for action by the President, the Congress and the business community. Only the President can take the lead to effectively restrain budget growth. He has to communicate to Congress and the American people that uncontrollable deficits are unaffordable.

As for Congress, the political squabbling must end. Congress must begin to work with the President on a bipartisan basis. Only immediate action to slow the growth of entitlements and defense will send the right signals to the marketplace and the financial community. We must see a convincing pattern of future deficits sloping toward zero.

The nation badly needs a broad public constituency behind the drive for budget constraint. Business must put management of the federal deficit at the top of its agenda, and so must every other interest group. It's simply too important to leave to someone else, and there is not one else. Nor is there more time. We're about to begin 1983. It will be a critical year. And before it ends, the politics of 1984 will be with us. The time for action is right now! It is your job and my job to do whatever is necessary to convince members of Congress and the Administration that our country cannot afford the budget deficits facing us in the next few years. I am confident that our country will not hide from reality and ignore a real danger. The danger is here, and I invite all of you to put the national interest first. Let's stand up for our future and be remembered as having shown political courage when it mattered. ●

#### SOVIET WATCH: SPEAKING OF BREZHNEV AND DEATH

#### HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the following for the benefit of our colleagues:

#### [From the Washington Times] SPEAKING OF BREZHNEV AND DEATH (By David Brudnoy)

BOSTON.—All tyrants should go out to such pleasantries. Of Leonid Brezhnev it was said that he was "a lusty and vigorous man" (John J. McCloy), that he was "a warmhearted man" (Armand Hammer), that his life was "meritorious" (President Mauno Koivisto of Finland), that he was "well-briefed" (Harold Wilson), that he was a "dedicated leader who relentlessly worked for his country" (Egyptian Minister of Foreign Affairs Boutros Ghali), that he "devoted every effort to world detente and to the strengthening of cooperation between states" (UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar).

Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan mouthed pap that amounts to nothing, but Richard Nixon said the truth of Brezhnev: "As a Russian he was warm, effusive and ebullient. As a communist, he was a ruthless schemer and relentless aggressor." Gotta hand it to Dick Nixon, he knows how to put those world leaders into perspective. (See Nixon's recently published book on leaders if you have any doubt about that. In fact, make no mistake about it. . . .)

The art of saying nothing ill of the dead is venerable, probably more than casually useful in the world of diplomacy, and yet so at variance with the commonly accepted canons of truth that, presumably, normal people never quite get the hang of it, except maybe when some relative they've always loathed dies and they have to face the bereaved and not grin.

Examples of utter balderdash uttered about the recently departed are legion and certainly anybody can think of some that particularly tickle the funnybone, though possibly our contemporary eulogizers, like those quoted on Brezhnev above, would best be able to speak nothing but good of the dead of all ages. Consider some choice reflections on the recently dead by that paragon of rectitude and even-handedness, the secretary general of the United Nations, Sr. Perez de Cuellar, who thinks Mr. Brezhnev "devoted every effort to world detente and to the strengthening of cooperation between states."

Of Lizzie Borden, Sr. Perez de Cuellar would say: "She honed her household utensils as she honed her wit, and drove deeply into the consciousness of her parents, leaving an indelible impression on them as on her community."

Of Tokyo Rose, the good secretary general would say: "She devoted her life to informing a waiting, watching world of events throughout the world, bringing messages of comfort and welcome to lonely hearts of lonely valiant soldiers far from their homes and much in need of succor."

Of Attila the Hun, friend Javier Perez de Cuellar would say: "He strode forth with determination and firm insistence on upholding his values and those of his people, and in bringing the message of the Hunnish people to neighboring lands, he saw to it that no stone was left unturned lest anyone be ignorant of his purpose."

Of Pontius Pilate, the chief officer of the United Nations would probably have said, if given the chance: "He stood foursquare for the brilliant value structure of the empire which he served so nobly, and in carrying out the sometimes awkward assignments that fell to him owing to his high station, he always gave the people a choice so that they, too, could participate in the affairs of

state. His best remembered trial ensured him a place in the history of mankind."

And one day, of the likes of Sr. Perez and those others who can't call a mass murderer, like Brezhnev a mass murderer, may it be said: "They hadn't a clue about common honesty and intellectual decency, and they went out sniveling like the hypocrites that they were." ●

#### TRIBUTE TO BESS TRUMAN

#### HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1982

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the death of Bess Truman saddened me a great deal. She was an outstanding woman who lived a long, full life, and was loved and respected by people all across the United States.

Although quiet and unassuming, Bess Truman left her mark on America. The former First Lady was best known for her quiet dignity and her marvelous sense of values. I think that the Washington Post editorial on Bess Truman expresses my thoughts very clearly. I would like to call it to your attention at this time.

#### ELIZABETH WALLACE TRUMAN

Women under 30 may wonder why Bess Truman, who died in Kansas City, Mo., this week at the age of 97, was an object of such affection and respect for those with a memory of postwar America. Surely she was not a political power in her own right, like Eleanor Roosevelt, or glamorous and exciting, Jacqueline Kennedy. She had no causes of her own, no protégés, no press conferences. Her husband said she looked "just the way a woman who has been married 25 years should look," and she described the role of first lady as requiring that a wife "sit beside her husband, be silent and be sure her hat is on straight." Why, then, was she so special to us?

In the years immediately following the turbulence of Depression and world war, Americans found reassurance and inspiration in the virtues Mrs. Truman personified. She was from the heartland and appeared to cherish all the good values of small-town America that we like to believe are universal in this country. She was warm, modest, friendly and home-loving. Her family came first, and that feeling was reciprocated by her husband and daughter. There is something touching about childhood sweethearts who marry, have a family, live in a white clapboard house and are still holding hands and enjoying private jokes on their 50th wedding anniversary. If President Truman held a personal grudge against anyone—public figure or private citizen—who had anything bad to say about his "girl," as he called his wife, we think better of him for it, and envy her.

Mrs. Truman had a sense of duty, dignity and quiet pride, and a sense of proportion. She was correct and gracious about everything she did in the White House and she served the country and her husband well. When it was all over, she was delighted to return to Independence, to her friends and to privacy. Within hours of leaving office, she was telling the former president to "go



up into the attic and put away the suitcases."

In each of our families there is a woman who looks rather like Bess Truman and who embodies the same down-to-earth virtues. She reminds us of someone we love—a mother, a teacher, a favorite aunt. We mourn her not so much as a public figure but for what we knew of her private role as a wife, mother and model for so many women of her generation.●

GARY A. LEE

## HON. DONALD J. MITCHELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1982

● Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to my colleague and good friend, Congressman GARY A. LEE. Although GARY will not be returning to Congress in 1983, he has certainly left his mark during the two terms he has served in the House of Representatives.

GARY came to Congress in 1979 with a solid background in State and local government. Drawing upon this experience, as well as his immense reserves of energy, imagination and enthusiasm, GARY became an active and aggressive Member of Congress.

During his years in House of Representatives, GARY has been a forceful advocate of restrained and responsible Federal policy. With an ever-watchful eye, GARY has closely guarded the concerns of American taxpayers and citizens. As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, he worked to achieve an orderly transfer of the Conrail railroad system to private ownership. As a member of the House Administration Committee, he has kept a close watch on the practices and policies of this legislative body. He has fought welfare fraud and abuse. He has proposed serious reform of congressional compensation procedures. He has represented his constituency well and effectively. He will be missed.

I wish him much good fortune in all future endeavors. I am sure he will be as successful in them as he was here in the House of Representatives.●

## THE UNDEMOCRATIC HOUSE

## HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a bitter irony that, at a time when the American public grows increasingly weary, restless, and angry because they feel that—regardless of who is in power—their voices are not heard here in Washington, the majority party finds a way to make these

voices even less audible. Rather than fashioning a more democratic (with a small "d") system whereby the public will can at the very least be given a proper hearing, the majority is attempting to further circumvent any such contact with the "rabble" of this Nation.

This autocratic power grab, under the guise of innocent-sounding "rules changes," is somewhat reminiscent of previous governments in history which retrenched when confronted with the stirrings of popular democratic spirits. And, if we recall that history, those governments were ultimately overthrown by those same citizens whose rights had been abridged and whose yearning for some element of democracy had been stifled. France, Austria, Russia, Germany, Italy—most of continental Europe suffered the consequences during the 19th century. And of course there is always the example of how a few contemptuous brigands had the gall to rebel when they were forced to pay taxes without being properly represented.

This body has already suffered years of inequity due to the failure of the majority to provide committee memberships in proportion to party ratios in the whole House. This has been bad enough; considerable legislation has waltzed through committees which otherwise would have undergone more diligent scrutiny had committees been properly apportioned.

But this adds insult to injury. Proposed rules changes will impose nothing less than one-party rule here in the House. Naturally, from the perspective of the majority party, it will be easier to pass legislation favorable to that side, the changes will facilitate the handling of controversial matters, and the legislative process will, ostensibly, be speeded up. But there are risks for the majority as well. There will no longer be any doubt in the public mind where responsibility will rest for every measure that passes muster under these new rules. Every thwarting of the public will—be it the stifling of balanced budget constitutional amendments or the ramming through of odious appropriations schemes—will bear the indelible stamp of the majority party upon it.

The attached statement issued December 10 by the House Republican leadership spells out the proposed changes and why they serve to undermine democracy in this body. This action is a travesty of governmental ethics and makes a mockery of our democratic process. And it is certainly beneath the dignity of any party which calls itself Democratic with a capital "D."

### STATEMENT BY THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

The proposed changes in House rules adopted by the Democratic Caucus this week are an exercise in political expediency

that will concentrate more power in the hands of the Speaker and further erode the democratic process in the House.

These new rules extend years of steady and systematic assaults on free and open debate and the rights of the minority in the House.

To deny Members of either party their right to influence the expenditure of public funds or vote on the merits of proposed Constitutional amendments or be alerted to and informed of critical legislative issues before the House is inexcusable and indefensible.

There is a clear distinction between rules changes designed to streamline and expedite legislative proceedings and those intended to subvert the process. The Democratic rules changes make no major contribution to the improved management of the House or the flow of legislation, but they do make major assaults on the Members' abilities and rights to influence the legislative process.

Making the House of Representatives more effective and more productive cannot be the ultimate goal of rules that muzzle the Membership.

Specifically, the amendment to Rule XXI, Clause 2, restricting riders to appropriation bills in order to limit use of public funds, deprives Members of all political persuasions of their ability to exercise full oversight responsibility. Deriving that right is a mockery.

The advent of omnibus appropriation bills and budget resolutions makes the need for limiting amendments even more critical. These rules changes virtually disenfranchise anyone who disagrees with spending levels reported from Committee unless, of course, the Democratic Leadership itself sanctions an amendment to reduce spending.

The new rule requiring a two-thirds majority vote on the discharge of a Constitutional amendment is an outrageous attempt to prevent any consideration of Constitutional change that does not conform with the will of the Democratic Leadership. The House must be given the opportunity to consider, debate and vote on the merits of Constitutional change in accordance with the intent of the founding fathers, who saw the need for such deliberation.

The intent of the Constitution is also thwarted by rules changes which prevent the call of a quorum to the floor prior to consideration of legislation.

The Constitution's Article I, Section 5, specifically instructs the Congress to have a quorum present to conduct business. Postponement of votes on the Journal and eliminating votes on consideration of bills would allow the Democratic Leadership to conduct legislative business without the Constitutionally-required majority quorum. These new rules merely perpetuate "phantom legislating," and enable the Speaker to stamper the House into actions it may regret.

Rules such as these do an injustice to the House and thwart the legislative process. They must not be adopted.

### SUMMARY OF DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS HOUSE RULES CHANGE PROPOSALS, 98TH CONGRESS

(1) *Appropriations Riders Restrictions.*—Clause 2, Rule XXI would be amended to prevent the offering of limitation amendments on the Floor unless already authorized by law for the period covered by the bill or if the House votes down a motion that the Committee rise after other amendments have been disposed of. Limitation amendments could still be reported by the

Appropriations Committee. The amendment also confines "retrenchment" amendments (e.g., those reducing salaries and personnel) to reductions in amounts of money covered by a bill, and to those recommended by the Appropriations, thus precluding authorizing committees from offering retrenchment amendments on the floor.

(2) *Resolutions of Inquiry.*—Clause 5, Rule XXII would be amended to permit committees 14 legislative days to report back to the House after referral of such a resolution requesting information from the heads of executive departments, and permits a committee, by majority vote, to extend the period for reporting by an additional 14 legislative days. The current rule permits only 7 legislative days for reporting back to the House, after which a motion to discharge the committee is in order.

(3) *Closed Hearings.*—Clause 2(g)(2)(B), Rule IX, would be amended to permit the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services and the Select Committee on Intelligence to vote in open session to close hearings for up to seven consecutive days. Current House Rules permit all committees to vote to close hearings for two consecutive days.

(4) *Resolving into the Committee of the Whole House.*—Clause 1, Rule XXIII would be amended to permit the Speaker to declare that the House is resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union at any time after the House had adopted a resolution from the Rules Committee providing for the consideration of a measure. Under present rules, the motion is subject to a vote by the House.

(5) *Approval of the Journal.*—Clause 5(b)(1), Rule I would be amended to permit the Speaker to postpone a vote on the approval of the Journal until later in the same legislative day. Under present rules, approval of the Journal is the second order of business in a legislative day and a vote may be demanded immediately.

(6) *Committee Membership.*—Clause 6, Rule X would be amended to make removal from committee membership automatic once a Member ceases to be a member of his party caucus or conference. Member would still be elected to committees by vote of the House on nominations from the party caucuses. Under the interpretation of present rules, it would take a vote of the House to remove a Member from a committee.

(7) *Tax Legislation.*—Clause 5, Rule XXI would be amended to prohibit non-tax committees from reporting any measure containing tax or tariff matters and the House from considering any amendment in the House or proposed by the Senate on a bill reported by a committee not having jurisdiction over tax matters.

(8) *Constitutional Amendments.*—Clause 4, Rule XXVII would be amended to require that a discharge motion for an amendment to the Constitution, or a resolution referred to the Committee on Rules providing for the consideration of a constitutional amendment, must contain the signatures of two-thirds of the membership of the House in order to be called up in the House.●

## STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA IS COMMEMORATED

### HON. IKE ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the outstanding public university system in North Carolina comprising 16 campuses with the excellent "flagship" University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has been recognized by an editorial in the Washington Post as having raised the level of education and maintained excellence in the higher education system while at the same time lowering costs. Since its inception in 1785 and in article 9 of its constitution adopted in 1868, public education has been valued in North Carolina.

I am respectfully inserting the attached editorial from the November 21, 1982, Washington Post in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, December 16, 1982, along with my commendation to Gov. James B. Hunt, Jr., President William Friday, Chancellor Christopher Fordham, Chancellor Bruce Poulton, and the other chancellors of the other members of the University of North Carolina system, and all those who share a part in this excellent record in higher education in North Carolina. Certainly, all of us in the Old North State can take pride in maintaining a high level of education while at the same time lowering costs. This is a notable record which we trust can be enjoyed by every State.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 21, 1982]

#### TUITION, FEES AND QUALITY

From time to time, various listings and guides rank the colleges by tuition and the cost of a year's education. It's generally pretty depressing, especially for the parents of children in their last years of high school. Most of the attention generally goes to the top of the list, a position currently occupied by Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where tuition and fees now run \$8,700 a year, and the total cost of a resident undergraduate is around \$13,500. But it's more interesting to look down the list for those institutions that maintain superior standards while managing, somehow, to keep the price down.

The leader in that more difficult test, among the large universities, is the University of North Carolina. Tuition and fees there come to \$702 this year for local students. (Those who are not fortunate enough to be North Carolina residents are charged a less unusual \$2,260.) Including living expenses and all, a resident student can typically get through the year on \$3,800. Throughout the country, on the average, college costs in both public and private institutions have been rising at just about the rate of inflation, which is to say that in the past four years, they have gone up by nearly half. At the University of North Carolina, they have gone up by less than a third. Why does the student pay less? Because the state pays more.

Public education is a creed and a passion in North Carolina. The people of the state

make it a point of pride not only to run a university that is manifestly one of the finest in the country, but to keep its doors open to students who haven't much money. North Carolina is not a rich state, but it has clear ideas about priorities.

Here in Washington, there is much urgent talk about the need to strengthen the national economy and the country's technological base. That talk usually drifts eventually toward tax gimmicks to push companies into more industrial research. How about investing that money, instead, in the people who are going to be running the companies and doing the research?

Congress, so far, has done a fairly effective job of protecting the student-aid programs from the administration's budget-cutters. But much of that aid is delivered in the form of loans, which means that young people emerge from four years of college with substantial burdens of debt. As public policy, that practice grows more questionable as the tuitions, and the debts, grow larger. A more useful and elevated example can be found in North Carolina, where the state keeps the threshold costs low and collects its interest in the broad benefits of a rising level of education.●

## ENERGY CONSERVATION COALITION

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I attended an awards reception sponsored by the Energy Conservation Coalition, which is a 2-year-old organization consisting of many groups dedicated to sensible energy policies and environmental protection.

I was extremely pleased to see my good friend and colleague, Mr. OTTINGER, who chairs the Subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Power of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, receive the group's annual energy conservation award. As Deborah Bleviss, president of the ECC said:

1982 will be remembered as the year when foreign oil imports reached their lowest levels since 1974, but we cannot count this as progress as long as recession, not efficiency, is reducing demand. Dick Ottinger understands this problem. He is one of Congress's strongest proponents of a least-cost energy strategy to stimulate a growing national economy while keeping our energy bills and oil imports to a minimum. He is a leading advocate for weatherizing the homes of poverty families, saving them and the nation millions of dollars in unnecessary energy costs. His persistence and dedication to the goal of an energy efficient society deserve particular praise at a time when many have become complacent about this country's energy needs.

I second Ms. Bleviss' remarks, and commend my good friend from New York for his continuing efforts on energy, and congratulate him for his receipt of the Energy Conservation Coalition's award.



The ECC made a second award presentation at its reception on Monday, and this was to the Wallingford Auditing Technical Team, of Wallingford, Conn. This group consists of some 21 high school students and their dedicated teacher, Carol Wilson. After performing energy audits of the various school buildings in the Wallingford school district, the group reduced heating oil consumption from 711,000 gallons to 492,000 gallons, and reduced electrical consumption by a million kilowatt-hours, which saved the local taxpayers a whopping \$260,000. The cost of achieving this was a meager \$12,000.

I was fortunate on Monday to meet some of these youngsters, many of whom are now energy auditors certified by the State of Connecticut, and to talk with them about their accomplishments. The possibility of seeing their efforts duplicated in other communities across the country is very exciting, and I want at this point to share with my colleagues a short paper describing what WATT has done, which was prepared by Carol Wilson, the energetic and marvelous lady who organized the group. I ask unanimous consent that "Teenagers as Energy Advocates" be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

#### TEENAGERS AS ENERGY ADVOCATES

(By Carol A. Wilson)

Wallingford, Connecticut has been fortunate to have an unusual group of teenagers, whose enthusiasm and concern for energy conservation has saved the community's schools over half a million dollars in two years.

The students, who call their group WATT (Wallingford Auditing Technical Team), did energy audits of schools and municipally-owned buildings. Their recommendations were heeded by the school board, with no expectation that any substantial savings could be achieved. To the amazement of all, in the first year oil consumption was reduced from 711,000 gallons to 492,000 gallons, and electrical consumption was down more than 1,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In the second year, similar savings were achieved. The dollars invested to achieve these savings were minimal, less than \$12,000.

Publicity about WATT's success, and efforts to tell the community how energy might be saved, have made Wallingford unusually energy-aware. In addition, teenagers in this New England community are viewed as worthwhile, contributing citizens, instead of nuisances.

WATT has received two grants to promote their efforts. They are presently making a videotape of the development of their group so that other communities can develop similar groups.

Imagine an energy conservation program that saves more than \$500,000 in two years, with an investment of less than \$12,000. Impossible? Not at all. This was accomplished in a New England school system—and by a group of high school students and their science teacher. What was done can be duplicated in any high school in the country.

The community where this happened is Wallingford, Connecticut, a town of 36,000 people which dates back to the seventeenth

century. It is proud of its colonial roots and its tradition of Yankee independence. Perhaps this is why the town fostered an unusual group of teenagers, teenagers who have helped the community become energy aware, and have saved the town substantial energy dollars.

The students call themselves "Wallingford Auditing Technical Team" (WATT). Members range from ages 13-18, freshmen to seniors, both male and female. The goals of WATT are to reduce energy waste in the schools, to increase awareness of the potential for conservation in all buildings of the community, and to educate people about the potential for renewable energy sources.

WATT grew from a classroom study of energy in grade 9 Earth Science. Reinforced by world events and attitudes acquired at home, these young people expressed a need to affect the energy future of their community. The summer of 1979 was spent struggling to do an energy audit of a middle school. An energy audit is a scientific analysis of energy use in a building. An auditor needs knowledge of heating systems, building materials, and building use patterns. The middle school audit showed many areas of energy waste. The students took their findings to the school board, and urged that a vigorous energy conservation program be instituted. The school board was doubtful that much energy could be saved, but appointed the students and their teacher as the Energy Management Committee for the school system. A custodian was designated Energy Conservation Officer to work with them.

WATT continued auditing schools and made recommendations based on these audits. Many of the students and their teacher became State Certified Energy Auditors. This certification made the town eligible for funds to pay for the audits through the Schools and Hospitals Program.

WATT conducted workshops for teachers of several schools in the community, in an effort to involve building users, both teachers and students, in the conservation program. Peer pressure was used to motivate schools to save electricity. Arrangements were made to have WATT receive copies of each school's electric bills. Usage was compared with that of the same period of the previous year, and the percentage of decrease or increase was noted. The schools were ranked in order of improvement, and copies of the rankings were sent to each school principal. In the first month, about half of the schools showed an increase, and half a decrease. After the initial report came out, there was a marked change. In the second month, only three of the schools had an increase, and ten a decrease. For the rest of that school year, no school showed an increase, and the school system saved more than a million kilowatt-hours of electricity without spending one cent.

WATT found that positive reinforcement was an effective tool in encouraging behavioral changes. Teachers and students who cooperated by reducing their energy use were commended publicly. Those who did not cooperate were not mentioned. It became desirable to save energy because you received recognition for your actions.

The Energy Conservation Officer met frequently with WATT, and acted on their suggestions. He closely monitored oil use, checking to see that temperatures were set back one hour before the close of school. Custodians were taught at monthly meetings how to manage their heating systems.

On days when warm temperatures were forecast furnaces were not turned up to 65 degrees in the morning, the anticipation that the sun would warm the building sufficiently. Serious leaks in building envelopes were repaired, furnaces were cleaned regularly, lighting was brought down to new state recommended level by the removal of excess bulbs and ballasts, and air conditioning was limited to occupied areas of the buildings.

The results of this program surprised everyone. In the first year, oil consumption was reduced more than 200,000 gallons, and electrical consumption was reduced 1.17 million kilowatt-hours. This saved the taxpayers of Wallingford more than \$260,000. The cost to the school board was the salary of the Energy Conservation Officer (less than \$9,000) and materials costing approximately \$3,000. In the second year, there was no Energy Conservation Officer because the school board did not fund the position. However, oil consumption remained down 175,000 gallons from the year prior to WATT, and electrical consumption remained about one million kilowatt-hours between the 1978-79 year. This saved another \$260,000 plus. Total dollars saved by the Wallingford schools now total over half a million dollars.

WATT also performed energy audits of all municipally-owned buildings in Wallingford, schools in Connecticut communities which had no Certified Energy Auditors, churches, business establishments and homes. An Appropriate Technology grant allowed WATT to sponsor an Energy Fair as a means of putting information about conservation and renewable energy sources into the hands of the people of the community. Publicity about the success of the WATT program has made the community unusually energy-conscious. The new Wallingford library gets 30 percent of its heat from the sun, and has solar-heated water for domestic use. Many energy conservation measures were incorporated into this new building, and WATT was invited to recommend energy-saving measures prior to its opening.

In September of 1981, the Governor of Connecticut recognized forty companies in the state for outstanding energy conservation programs. Five of these awards went to Wallingford companies, the school system among them. A community with one percent of the population of the state has received 12½ percent of the awards.

The WATT members have benefitted from the program. They have learned how important and effective a knowledgeable individual can be. They have developed leadership qualities far beyond their peers. They have gained academic skills in communication, organization of both time and information, mathematics, geometry, and physics. They have been recognized by their community and peers as an energy resource, and have done much to remove the barrier between senior citizens and teenagers. They have gained insight into career opportunities, and have gained a marketable skill. Many of them have earned money for doing energy audits.

WATT continues to find ways to help people learn about saving energy. WATT has worked with the Connecticut Energy Division in planning and presenting workshops aimed at developing groups similar to WATT in other Connecticut high schools. WATT members have made presentations at state and national conferences on energy and science education. WATT provided the major impetus for Connecticut Energy Edu-

cation Day in 1982, and will again lead the project in 1983. WATT recently received a grant from the American Public Power Association to make a videotape about the development of WATT. This videotape will be made available on loan to any community served by a public power company. The dream of WATT is to see every high school in the United States with its own WATT group, and every community saving hundreds of thousands of energy dollars, and million of BTUs as Wallingford has done.

## MEMBERS OF WATT

Paula Clogher,<sup>1</sup> David Combs,<sup>1</sup> Jonathan Duke,<sup>1</sup> Kathleen Goodrich,<sup>1</sup> Brendan Goodrich, Seth Hillman,<sup>1</sup> Kimberly Hoover, Gina Juliano, William Karlon,<sup>1</sup> Michael Kischkum,<sup>1</sup> Thomas Masse,<sup>1</sup> Maryrose Meade, Lauren Montgomery, Valerie Philbrick,<sup>1</sup> Fred Rutcho,<sup>1</sup> Stuart Schouten, Lisa-Anne Soucy,<sup>1</sup> Michael Sullivan,<sup>1</sup> David Wargo,<sup>1</sup> Alan Zupka.

Advisor: Carol A. Wilson. ●

## ED WEBER

## HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a good friend and fine Member of Congress, Ed WEBER, who has represented the congressional district neighboring mine to the north for the past 2 years.

Ed has capably served the 9th Ohio District throughout the 97th Congress. He has distinguished himself as a Representative closely attuned to the needs and concerns of his constituents, traveling home to Toledo virtually every weekend to meet with area groups and participate in local activities.

A well-known member of the Toledo legal community, he diligently applied his extensive knowledge of the law to his duties as a member of the House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee. As a member of this panel, he was a leader in efforts to bolster the urban development action grant (UDAG) program, of particular importance to his inner-city Toledo.

Although he held no public office before coming to Congress in 1980, Ed proved to be a very effective legislator and dedicated public servant. He learned the ropes quickly and earned the respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

It is my understanding that Ed now plans to return to private law practice. I know my colleagues will join with me in telling him we will miss him and in wishing him every success in future endeavors. ●

<sup>1</sup>Certified energy auditor.

## MICHAEL LEWAN: A LAST AT BAT

## HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Michael Lewan, my able administrative assistant, and an extremely talented young man, with whom I have been associated for the last 9 years. Without Mike's help, I might not be standing in the well of this House today.

All too often, congressional staffers labor in anonymity. Now that Mike is leaving the Hill to embark on a new career in the private sector, I want to acknowledge the debt that I and the people of the 13th Congressional District of Brooklyn owe to him.

A graduate of Nazareth High School in Brooklyn, and an alumnus of the Baruch College and the Maxwell School of Public Administration, Mike has been my administrative assistant since my election to Congress in 1974. Mike organized my staff, set up and managed my district offices, and ably represented me in Brooklyn and in Washington.

He is an exemplary public servant who has always been willing to do whatever needed to be done. He is conscientious and thorough, dedicated and tenacious, creative and disciplined. He has been my right hand man.

I would not want you to think that Mike is totally serious. In fact, he would probably be hard pressed to say which is his greatest accomplishment: keeping my office running smoothly and happily or captaining the "Solarz System" softball team to the House Softball League "A" Division championship in 1982.

More than being the key member of my staff, Mike has been my friend. It is difficult for me to briefly express what Mike's friendship has meant to me, and to my wife Nina. He has become a part of our family.

Mike is leaving my office to take advantage of a new opportunity. I am certain that he will be successful because he succeeds at whatever he does. I want to wish him well and to say to him what the poet Yeats so well expressed about loyal and true friends: "Think where man's glory most begins and ends, and say my glory was I had such friends." ●

## MRS. BESS TRUMAN

## HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1982

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Bess Truman, wife of President Harry S.

Truman will be remembered by Americans not only as a First Lady but as a great lady.

Her death at age 97 on October 18, at her home in Independence, Mo., came as sad though inevitable news.

We shall always remember Bess Truman as the quiet, dignified, and graceful lady who was so much a part of our national scene at the side of her husband, our President, during the later years of World War II and the difficult years which followed that war.

Who can assess the comfort and devotion she lavished upon our President to make his days more bearable during the times when he was called upon to make decisions which framed our national and international lives for decades.

My deepest sympathies go to the members of the Truman family. ●

## BOB SHAMANSKY

## HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that our colleague from Ohio, BOB SHAMANSKY, will not be returning to the House and the Foreign Affairs Committee in the coming year.

In the one term that he has been in the House, Bob has made a major contribution to the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee and especially to the work of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, which I have the honor to chair. He has brought to the consideration of the difficult and technical problems that come before that subcommittee a keen analytical mind, as well as a broad background in law and a familiarity with conditions around the world. His questions of witnesses have been probing and his suggestions for amendments valuable.

Bob has become expert in a number of fields. One, which I consider of transcendent importance to the United States and the world, is the problem of the proliferation of nuclear weapons capability. Bob has correctly brought out the weaknesses of the so-called safeguards system operated by the International Atomic Energy Agency and has energetically called for its strengthening.

In addition to his substantive contributions, Bob has invariably been a pleasure to work with, not least because of his delightful sense of humor. My wife June and I have enjoyed his company on a number of occasions.

We wish him well in all his future pursuits and hope that he will soon return to the House. ●



SUPPLEMENT TO STATEMENT  
ON H.R. 5121

## HON. DAN MARRIOTT

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. MARRIOTT. Mr. Speaker, since the difference between the House and Senate versions of the Federal oil and gas royalty management bill is in the Miller-Marriott amendment (sec. 114 of H.R. 5121), I would like to say a few words in explanation of that amendment.

Section 114 gives the Secretary discretionary authority to increase the royalty rate for noncompetitive onshore oil and gas leases from the currently mandated 12½ to 16½ percent. The section also sets forth certain standards or findings which must be met or made by the Secretary prior to any increase above 12½ percent; that is, first, the impact on future oil or gas exploration, development, or production and second, the impact on overall revenues to the Federal Government generated by such activity.

The Linowes Commission recommended that onshore oil and gas lease royalty rates be increased from 12½ to 16½ percent. However the Commission based its recommendation on the rationale that the royalty should be the same for both onshore and offshore leases, and on the belief that royalties in the private sector had been rising. The Commission envisioned the higher royalty as a means to finance improved royalty collection procedures.

It is a matter of record that the Linowes Commission made no formal study to substantiate its position, making no distinction between the very different circumstances of offshore and onshore leasing, and thus did not analyze the true impact higher royalty rates might have. The Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office in a September 3, 1982, report to the Interior Committee on the subject, points out that not only did the Linowes Commission fail to study the issue, it was acting on beliefs which were not substantiated. The Comptroller General found that "12½ percent is still the predominant royalty used in the private sector." Further, his report concludes:

We found no conclusive arguments either for or against a higher royalty. . . . Such a decision ideally should consider the total cost to a lessee to acquire, hold, and develop Federal leases.

Both the report of the U.S. General Accounting Office "Possible Effect on Increased Royalty Rate for Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leases" (September 3, 1982) and the study completed by the Interior Department entitled "Final Report on Potential Impacts of Changing Royalty Rates and Systems

for Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leases" (May, 1982) indicate that the advantages and disadvantages of a royalty rate increase are uncertain, primarily because of the two factors to which section 106 directs the Secretary's attention: First, the impact on future oil or gas exploration, development or production and second, the impact on overall revenues to the Federal Government generated by such activity. Both factors are interrelated.

At least two responses to an increase in royalty can offset the prospective revenue gains. First, gross royalties are tax deductible so the increase in gross royalty payments is much larger than total revenue increase. Second, increasing royalty obligations can cause fields that are only marginally profitable at the lower royalty rate not to be developed and may induce firms with access to other, cheaper sources of oil and gas to reduce production from these fields. Both the Interior Department report and the GAO reports agree that it is entirely possible that the increased tax deductions resulting from a royalty increase and possible decreases in production from fields subject to Federal royalties will actually reduce Federal revenues instead of yielding the hoped-for increase.

Increased royalty rates for onshore noncompetitive leases may also impact exploration and hence downstream revenues as well as future domestic production. A large percentage of the exploration done in the wildcat areas for which noncompetitive onshore oil and gas leases are issued is performed by smaller independent companies. These companies may be discouraged from exploring in areas where the oil or gas potential is unknown when faced with a royalty burden which exceeds 12½ percent. The less exploration activity there is, the less likely it is that domestic production will be coming onstream to generate much-needed energy supplies as well as the desired revenue generated by such activity.

As a result of these uncertainties, the Interior Committee chose to give the Secretary the discretion to raise the royalty rate on noncompetitive onshore oil and gas leases but conditioned the exercise of his discretion to insure that he will take into account the long-range, overall impacts of his decision. The committee believed that by requiring the Secretary to take into account these effects, this section will force him to consider the impacts of his decision in the public interest.●

A GREAT IDEA FOR HELPING  
ELDERLY WITH UTILITY BILLS

## HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Pascagoula, Miss., has developed a unique approach for helping elderly or handicapped people with their utility bills. Project COPE is further explained in this article from the Mississippi Press of December 6, 1982. I urge my colleagues to read this article and decide whether it can be made applicable in their own districts. Its innovation is truly outstanding.

[From the Mississippi Press, Dec. 6, 1982]

PROJECT COPE SET TO BEGIN; TO AID  
ELDERLY WITH UTILITIES

(By Gloria Moore)

Pascagoula's Project COPE (Caring Offered to Pascagoula's Elderly) will get under way Tuesday with the mailing of city utility bills.

Utility customers will be given the opportunity to add \$1 to their payment, a dollar that will help the elderly and handicapped with payment of natural gas bills, electric bills, propane-butane expenses or furnace repairs.

The project is voluntary and has been structured so that each dollar a person gives goes directly to help someone. No salaries or other expenses will be paid out of the gifts.

City Manager Charles Fulghum said similar programs have been successfully operated by natural gas and electric companies on a regional basis but Pascagoula is the first city in the country to undertake this method of assisting the elderly handicapped with home energy related expenses.

The criteria for receiving help is as follows:

1. Must be a resident of Pascagoula.
2. Elderly age 60 years or over.
3. Handicapped-disabled physician-certified.
4. No other obvious resources available for payment of the energy-related expense.
5. Needs of a last-resort nature without regard to age.

Fulghum explained customers may simply add \$1 to their utility payment and the city will direct each of these donated dollars to the American Red Cross which will distribute the money. The city computer has been programmed to handle the extra \$1 donations and persons desiring to give more than \$1 per month should send their gift to Project COPE, American Red Cross, P.O. Box 276, Pascagoula, 39567.

Information on applying for assistance may be obtained by contacting the Information and Referral Service of the United Way, 1309 Market St., telephone, 762-8557. The I&R staff will help the Red Cross to screen applicants.

A pamphlet outlining the details of COPE will be mailed with the December utility bills.

Fulghum said COPE provides a way for residents to assist those in need. He shared with The Mississippi Press a letter he received following the announcement of the COPE project in the newspaper.

I am an elderly woman myself and on Social Security. But God is so good to me and I know He takes care of me.

"This isn't much, but I would like to help. Enclosed is \$2."

Fulghum explained the assistance of the United Way and the Red Cross in receiving applications and disbursing funds makes it possible for every dollar received going to assist the elderly-handicapped.

He said the program will be monitored by an independent committee representing the elderly, handicapped ethnic groups and others.●

#### THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COLLEGE OF COMMERCE AT DE PAUL UNIVERSITY

#### HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, a 16-month celebration is underway to celebrate the 70th anniversary of the College of Commerce at DePaul University. As a graduate of DePaul, I want to take a moment to congratulate the college, the 10th business school formed in the country and the first at a Catholic university. The city of Chicago, the State of Illinois, and the Nation have been well served for 70 years by this fine educational facility.

Established in 1912, the College of Commerce at DePaul is the sixth largest accredited graduate school of business in the country and the ninth largest accredited undergraduate school of business at a private university. Nearly 7,000 students are currently enrolled in the graduate and undergraduate programs of the college and nearly 49 percent of all students attending DePaul are enrolled in commerce, graduate or undergraduate, day or evening.

The theme for the celebration—September 1, 1982 to December 31, 1983, is "DePaul: Educating Chicago business leaders for 70 years." Over 35,000 alumni live and work within 150 miles of the downtown and Lincoln Park Campus so it is certainly an appropriate theme. Other graduates live throughout Illinois and the country as well as abroad. The influence of the college is far reaching.

The anniversary will focus on the contribution of DePaul's College of Commerce to business, industry, and the professional lives of the community. As the dean and professor at the college, Brother Leo V. Ryan, C.S.V., reminds us, DePaul was founded to provide opportunities for five generations of Chicagoans to go to college and to achieve upward social and economic mobility through higher education. DePaul alumni have achieved this goal and continue today to be faithful to the original mission. DePaul offers opportunities for thousands of men and women of all ages to develop compe-

tence enhanced by values and to serve both through business and also through their family, church, civic, and social activities.

I know many people will be joining in this important celebration in recognition of this milestone in the life of the College of Commerce and that my colleagues join with me in commending the college and congratulating them on 70 years of excellence.●

#### TRIBUTE TO FORMER FIRST LADY MRS. BESS TRUMAN

#### HON. BALTAZAR CORRADA

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1982

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my friend IKE SKELTON and our colleagues in paying tribute to former First Lady Bess Truman, who passed away on October 18.

Mrs. Truman was a loving wife and devoted mother who, according to President Truman was "the Boss" in the Truman household. She was a gracious First Lady, although by nature she was a shy and unpretentious woman.

When Vice President Truman became President under tragic and difficult conditions following President Roosevelt's death, Mrs. Truman undertook her responsibilities with dignity and a sense of duty to her Nation.

Mrs. Truman lived a full and long life and she will be remembered with love, respect and gratitude by her fellow citizens in the 50 States as well as in Puerto Rico.●

#### IN MEMORY OF GEORGE KISTIAKOWSKY, 1900-82

#### HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, George Kistiakowsky, who died December 7, set an example of public service that has inspired many, both within the science community and throughout the Nation. His outstanding 47-year career in basic chemical research was combined with involvement in the Manhattan project and with giving advice to the Federal Government. During 1959-61, he served as President Eisenhower's science adviser.

Today and in the future, when many policy decisions will require technical expertise and when many technical developments will demand public attention and concern, we will miss George Kistiakowsky. He took very seriously his responsibility to use his intellect and wisdom to work for a livable world. Because he was an outstanding

scientist and bipartisan public servant, his clear and honest critique of the nuclear arms race carried great weight and could not be easily dismissed. His arms control efforts over the past decade have helped lay a foundation for rational debate over nuclear arms policies. It is now our responsibility to build on that foundation.

I wish to insert articles from the December 14 edition of the Washington Post and the December 13 issue of Chemical and Engineering News which capture some of the respect and affection felt by those who knew him. The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 14, 1982]

GEORGE B. KISTIAKOWSKY, 1900-82

(By Boisfeuillet Jones Jr.)

In an awesome way nuclear weapons have forced the question of scientists' responsibility for the potential use of their technological achievements. George B. Kistiakowsky, an eminent American scientist who died Tuesday at the age of 82, faced this question for several decades in advising on weapons to deter and on arms control. His dedicated efforts contributed to the nation's security.

A Harvard chemistry professor and explosives expert Kistiakowsky designed the triggering device for the atomic bomb at Los Alamos, N.M., in 1945. He has been widely quoted as remarking, after seeing that first explosion, "I am sure that at the end of the world—in the last millisecond of the Earth's existence—the last human will see what we saw."

This apprehension did not presage a sentimental or idealistic reaction on Kistiakowsky's part. He was later a scientific adviser to the Defense Department, serving on various weapons committees, including one which in 1954 urged that top priority be given to the development of an intercontinental ballistic missile. He served for a year and a half during 1959-61 as President Eisenhower's science adviser, a post created as a consequence of Sputnik in 1957 and carrying considerable influence during that period. He continued to advise the government on military and foreign policy matters until 1967, when he ceased because of disagreement with the Johnson administration over the Vietnam War.

For those of us who knew Kistiakowsky in his later years, when he was a strongly opinionated and vocal commentator on the implications of security issues, it is impossible to think of the man as a subservient technician. He attributed his growing skepticism about defense policies in large part to the personal influence of President Eisenhower, whom he came to admire greatly, and who turned to Kistiakowsky as a source of independent advice during his years on the President's Science Advisory Committee and as science adviser.

Afterward, from 1962 to 1969, Kistiakowsky served on the advisory board to the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. By the early 1970s he was criticizing the extent that federal resources were allocated to research and development for defense and space programs while civilian technological programs went relatively unsupported. In his last years, Kistiakowsky expressed outrage and pessimism at the seemingly uncontrollable escalation of the nuclear arms race. His death deprives the nuclear debate of a critic whose credentials



and basically non-ideological background meant that his views had to be seriously dealt with on their merits.

Quite apart from his absorption in these public issues, Kistiakowsky lived a rich and useful life. He was born in Russia in 1900, the son of a law professor, and served in the anti-Soviet White Russian army after the revolution in 1917. Thereafter he escaped to Germany, earned a PhD, and came to the United States in 1926. After four years at Princeton, he joined the Harvard faculty in 1930 and remained there for the rest of his life.

I knew him as a neighbor in Cambridge, where he lived in a modest style with his wife, Elaine. With characteristic rigor and attention to detail, Kistiakowsky concentrated late in life alternately on publishing the diary of his White House years, writing about arms control issues, gardening at his "dacha" on Cape Cod, and overseeing the life and times of his corgi. He was amiably crusty and blunt, the object of affection among his colleagues, students and acquaintances. At times, his biting wit and scathing judgments on people and issues could astonish.

Eisenhower wasn't the only one who respected Kistiakowsky for his outspoken, independent views. It was a privilege to have known him.

[From Chemical and Engineering News,  
Dec. 13, 1982]

GEORGE KISTIAKOWSKY, 1900-82

(By Michael Heylin, Editor)

This reporter never knew George Kistiakowsky well enough to call him "Kisty," as his friends did. We really met only once. That was in his office at the Harvard chemistry department one cold afternoon in January 1981 to talk at length about his efforts to lessen the danger of nuclear war. He was the kind of man you only had to meet once to appreciate his incredible intellect, sparkle, and wit.

Now he is dead at 82. But the struggle for rational arms policies goes on. Ironically, he died the day the House of Representatives voted to delete initial funds for deploying 100 MX intercontinental ballistic missiles. This vote may not represent Congress' final disposition of this matter. But it is the first time since World War II that either house has voted to deny a President a major new arms program.

Very few scientists, and no other chemists, were better qualified than Kistiakowsky to speak out on nuclear arms. His outstanding 47-year career in basic chemical research, much of it related to explosives, was interlaced with involvement in the Manhattan Project, and with advisory roles to the federal government—including science adviser to President Eisenhower.

For his government service he was honored with medals by three Presidents—Truman, Eisenhower, and Johnson. His enormous scientific contributions were recognized by a host of awards, including ACS's highest honor, the Priestley Medal.

As he said that January afternoon, his life was divided into four equal parts (C&EN, Feb. 2, 1981, page 20). The first involved growing up in prerevolutionary Russia and experiencing war first hand. The second was all chemistry—a Ph.D. at the University of Berlin before moving on to Princeton and then Harvard. The next 20 years were half chemistry and half weapons buildings. And, as he put it, "The last 20 years I have been trying mostly to undo the nuclear weap-

ons—and this has been my least successful [period]."

His disillusionment with U.S. arms and defense policies came slowly. He said he "began to see all the lies, such as the so-called missile gap." By then, in his position as President Eisenhower's science adviser, he knew there was no such gap. As he explained, "I began to realize that policy was being formed in a way that was really quite questionable." Finally, in January 1968, he resigned from his government advisory positions as a protest against the Vietnam war. After retiring from active research in 1971 he devoted all his vast energies to the prevention of nuclear war. In recent years he served as chairman of the Council for a Livable World, a group founded in 1962 by nuclear physicist Leo Szilard to strengthen security through arms control.

Kistiakowsky will be sorely missed in the rising national debate over nuclear arms policies—a debate that cries out for clear, totally honest and scientifically trained minds such as his. But his efforts over the past decade or so have helped lay a foundation for rational debate. He and others of like mind are not calling for unilateral U.S. disarmament, as some suggest they are. They realize a deterrent force is necessary. They are not working against U.S. security and to the advantage of the Soviet Union, as those in the highest places have charged. All they are saying—and all a growing portion of the public is saying—is that the superpowers must find ways other than a headlong race to ever more sophisticated nuclear weapons to handle their differences and so assure the security of all mankind.●

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. DAN MARRIOTT

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. MARRIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present on the floor of the House of Representatives Monday, December 13, 1982, for roll-call votes Nos. 435 and 436. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on S. 2355 Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982; and "nay" on House Joint Resolution 429, State commissions on teacher excellence.●

#### THE NORTH AMERICAN LAKE MANAGEMENT SOCIETY

#### HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, several years ago the U.S. Council on Environmental Quality noted that more than one-third of the Nation's publicly owned lakes were degraded by toxics, silt, algae, or weeds and need restoration. The significance of these problems ranges from old deposits of toxic substances that threaten public drinking water supplies to accumulations of sediment caused by urban development that totally fill lakes. I would

like to share with you a few words about the efforts of an organization that is concerned about these lake quality problems and about the impairment of public benefits from these waters.

I would like to acknowledge the efforts of the North American Lake Management Society (NALMS) in focusing attention on these polluted lakes. Often regulatory agencies are more concerned about controlling pollution to rivers and streams and have not devoted sufficient resources to the more complex pollution problems existing in or threatening lakes and impoundments. The society was formed by citizens interested in cleaning up dirty lakes and protecting clean lakes. Planners, engineers, government officials, scientists, and citizens have joined NALMS to work for safe drinking water, unimpaired recreation, useful industrial water supplies, and fishing opportunities so that these lake quality benefits can be inherited and enjoyed by future generations of Americans.

Members of NALMS have promoted clean lakes by holding annual conferences on lake management and restoration around the country and in Canada. The scientific reports from these meetings are like those mandated by section 304(j) of the Clean Water Act to be submitted to Congress as an update of information describing lake quality problems and current restoration capabilities and techniques. What is clear from these reports is that our Nation's lakes are still very much in trouble from polluting substances and need vigorous attention. NALMS promotes information exchange among scientists, consultants, and lake managers through a newsletter to share new information or techniques. The NALMS board of directors frequently prepares legislative positions and gives testimony before Congress to acquaint us with lake management problems and the need to support Federal and State programs for resolving these problems. The society is also working with State administrators and legislative bodies to build State programs capable of addressing this serious national problem. The society provides information to citizens and urges them to let their U.S. congressional and State delegations know what they think and need. With the overwhelming citizen support for environmental protection and improvement, and particularly with our vital lake resources that has surfaced in recent public opinion polls, it is important that we support their concerns.

While debate on the Clean Water Act will continue into the next session of Congress, I am concerned about this debate and would like to share with you the position statement on key sections of the Clean Water Act that was

prepared by members of the North American Lake Management Society:

#### POLICY STATEMENT

While the Nation can be proud of the progress made in controlling conventional pollutants, much remains to be accomplished in correcting water quality problems from nonconventional and toxic pollutants. The flowing waters of rivers and streams have the ability to flush pollutants downstream and cleanse themselves once controls are implemented, but impounded and lake waters have less capability to do so, and they continue to suffer from decades of deposited pollutants. Congress recognized in 1972 that the Nation's water quality goals could not be reached without a lake restoration program to clean up this accumulation of pollutants and enacted the Section 314 Clean Lakes Program. After almost a decade of struggling in building an experimental program to demonstrate the effectiveness of lake quality restoration, the Clean Lakes Program became operational in 1980 with the publication of formal regulations. However, the program was eliminated from EPA's proposed budget in 1981.

Likewise, Congress recognized in 1972 that cost effective pollution control can only be achieved by considering point and nonpoint source abatement tradeoffs on an areawide basis as specified in Section 208 of the Act. While EPA devoted funding to nonpoint source planning, point/nonpoint source control tradeoffs were often ignored and a mechanism for ensuring the implementation of "208 plans" was never established. EPA devoted funding for this important concept of planning cost-effective pollution abatement in 1981.

The elimination of funding for lake restoration, point/nonpoint source abatement tradeoff planning, and other activities mandated by Congress has been called a backdoor repeal of the Clean Water Act by the public and by some members of Congress. NALMS recommends that Congress reaffirm the importance of such essential programs by specifically calling for their implementation in the amended Clean Water Act as well as in the Conference Report.

#### CLEAN LAKES PROGRAM

The Clean Lakes Program has demonstrated that its State-Federal partnership can motivate local participation to address pollution problems in lakes in a very cost-effective manner. NALMS strongly urges that the impaired use caused by toxics contamination, sedimentation, and excessive growths of algae and weeds (conditions that plague more than 10,000 publicly owned lakes) be considered a national problem worthy of modest Federal involvement through continuation of the Section 314 Clean Lakes Program. With the increased burden of programs being transferred to the States, most of them cannot be expected to develop expertise and establish programs to provide leadership in lake restoration. Section 314 should be reestablished at its present authorization for a five-year period so that this 50 percent Federal, 50 percent local and State implementation program may be continued. EPA should be directed to encourage State assumption of the program after the five years, at which time the Federal program will sunset.

#### NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION

NALMS supports the retention of the mandatory planning mechanism that will ensure cost-effective implementation of pollution controls through point and nonpoint source abatement tradeoffs on a compre-

hensive, watershed-wide basis. Originally established in Section 208, this mechanism must be institutionalized into the waste-load allocation, water quality standards, Construction Grants, and NPDES processes, and the planning mechanism recently established in Section 205(j) as part of P.L. 97-117 may not be sufficient to do so.

NALMS recommends that Congress address the national problem of nonpoint source pollution by requiring in Section 208 the consideration of point/nonpoint source abatement tradeoffs in watersheds with priority water quality problems. A 50 percent Federal, 50 percent non-Federal matching grant program would be established under Section 208 to conduct specific interagency nonpoint source implementation projects in urban and rural problem watersheds. The Section 208(j) Rural Clean Water Program would be reestablished as part of this cooperative, interagency approach to nonpoint source pollution.

#### CLEAN WATER ACT GOALS

Public opinion has shown overwhelming support for retaining the goals and approaches specified for pollution control in the Clean Water Act. NALMS reaffirms its support for the two national goals specified in Section 101, but recommends that they be modified to reflect a more realistic timeframe for compliance and to recognize the importance of controlling toxic substances. NALMS suggests that the "zero discharge" goal be modified to read "It is the national goal that the discharge of toxic pollutants into waters of the United States be eliminated by July 1, 1987" and the "fishable, swimmable" goal be revised to reflect a new target date of July 1, 1987.

#### WATER QUALITY CRITERIA

Some industry and business groups have criticized the scientific adequacy of water quality criteria and technology-based effluent standards established by EPA. These groups wish to abandon effluent standards in favor of State criteria and standards established for local conditions. The local water quality standards-based approach to pollutant control was abandoned in the early 1970s because scientific inadequacy, insufficient State funding for monitoring and analysis, and political pressure often stymied pollution control efforts. There is no reason to believe that a return to the same system will work today, especially with new questions concerning the scientific adequacy of criteria and recent criticism by the U.S. General Accounting Office of frequently used water quality monitoring programs.

NALMS recommends that a national research program be authorized to resolve the scientific questions surrounding water quality criteria, point/nonpoint source abatement tradeoff methodologies, cause/effect relationships between impaired water use and upstream pollution sources, and methods for improving lake water quality. This would be accomplished by amending Sections 104 and 304 of the Act. Special emphasis should be placed on a cooperative effort between EPA and the States to develop regional watershed specific water quality criteria for toxics to protect designated uses. Such a nationally coordinated approach would be more cost-effective than each State duplicating such efforts. The goal would be to implement a water quality based system for establishing effluent limitations after BAT, BCT, and secondary treatment are installed over the next five years.

#### TECHNOLOGY-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS

NALMS supports the retention of technology-based effluent limitations, BAT and BCT requirements for industry, and secondary treatment for municipalities. BAT variances may be provided if bioassays and/or biomonitoring show no acute or chronic toxicity problems and "fishable" use designations are being attained. Case-by-case variances for secondary treatment may be given if water quality standards are not being violated and "fishable-swimmable" uses are being attained. Section 301 should be amended to specifically appropriate funding for all BAT limitations to be developed by 1984 and to set a compliance deadline of mid-1987.

#### CONSTRUCTION GRANTS PROGRAM

Congress established the Construction Grants program to hasten the initial construction of publically owned treatment works (POTW's). In some cases, industries and businesses that discharge into these municipal plants receive a significant public subsidy in treating their pollution problems. A recent report to Congress by U.S. General Accounting Office documented the existence of this subsidy and warned that the future successful operation of these municipal treatment works (and protection of water quality) may be in jeopardy because most municipalities are not charging adequate user fees. Most are not setting aside funding for plant replacement or improvement and other public revenues are used to subsidize operation and maintenance.

In 1972, Congress specified that an industrial cost recovery program and sufficient user charges be established so that public funds would not be used to treat industrial wastewater. Congress also mandated a pretreatment program so that industrial wastes would not overload or interfere with operation of these treatment works. In recent years, the industrial cost recovery program was eliminated and pretreatment regulations were suspended. It appears that the intent of Congress to avoid public subsidy of industrial treatment was not carried out. NALMS strongly urges Congress to address this deficiency by amending the Act to set a deadline (10 years hence) to phase out the Construction Grants Program. The amendment would contain a provision for all industries discharging to POTW's improved with Federal funds to contribute "industrial cost recovery" payments to a State trust fund for making POTW's self-sufficient.

This could be supplemented by State established construction grants programs financed by sales of bonds. The amendment should specify sufficient user charges for improved operation and maintenance and national minimum standards for pretreatment programs. Industry should be required to handle toxic sludge from the pretreatment process rather than saddle the public with costly disposal of contaminated sludge. NALMS recognizes the need to streamline complex pretreatment regulations, but most municipalities cannot be expected to effectively implement pretreatment programs for political reasons without national categorical pretreatment standards.

#### DREDGE AND FILL PROGRAM

NALMS recognizes the importance of wetlands in protecting water quality and providing habitat for fisheries and wildlife resources. We oppose the current pressure from developmental groups to limit the Section 404 Dredge and Fill program to strictly navigable waters rather than the valuable



headwaters wetlands they wish to develop. NALMS supports a reauthorization of Section 404 in its current form and recommends that a strong Congressional mandate be included that clearly opposes any artificial drainage, land conversion, or development of wetlands classified by the U.S. Department of Interior through refusal of the 404 permit or through enforcement action.

#### GROUND WATER

Ground water is a valuable resource for recharging lakes and rivers as well as for providing inexpensive drinking water. Comprehensive planning for protecting both ground water and surface water has not been implemented under the Clean Water Act despite the existing statutory requirements in Sections 102, 208, and 304. Because of the fragmentation of responsibility for ground water among many pieces of legislation, NALMS recommends that the Clean Water Act be amended to provide the planning and coordination mechanism for assuring that ground water uses are protected. NALMS supports amending Section 304 to authorize funding for developing regional ground water quality criteria for protecting ground water uses and to mandate State adoption of the criteria. The Act should be amended to include consideration of ground water impacts under the NPDES program and to coordinate ground water planning and protection strategies as part of an element of State water quality (recognized as both surface and ground water) management programs under Section 208. This would provide a national framework to improve performance of both Federal and State programs in a coordinated fashion.

#### DAMS AS POINT SOURCES

A recent court decision established that discharges from dams/impoundments are subject to Section 402 NPDES requirements if they cause downstream impairment of water quality. Despite the very serious nature of these water quality problems in many sections of the Nation (not only impacting aquatic life and municipal water supplies but also suppressing economic development), some groups are petitioning Congress to amend the Act to exempt dams from Section 402 requirements. NALMS opposes this action because water quality problems downstream of dams can often be traced to upstream pollution sources that also impact lake water quality. Congress should amend Section 402 to confirm the applicability of the NPDES program to all point source discharges, including dams that cause downstream water quality problems.●

**CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO  
THE HONORABLE HARRY  
CONRAD NAGEL OF WAYNE,  
N.J., DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN,  
SENIOR CONFECTIONER, AND  
GREAT AMERICAN**

#### HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 9, the residents of my congressional district and the State of New Jersey will join together in testimony to an outstanding confectioner, distinguished citizen, and good friend, the Honorable Harry Conrad Nagel,

whose birthday celebration commemorating the 85th year of his birth will provide an opportunity for his relatives and many, many friends to express tribute to his lifetime of good works. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations to him, his good wife Virginia, three sons, Harry William, Robert Henry, and Theodore Christian; daughters-in-law, seven grandchildren and four great-grandchildren on this most joyous occasion in testimony to the quality of his leadership and professional expertise in his field of endeavor, the warmth of his friendship, and his standards of excellence in our American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, the pleasure of great personal dedication and always working to the peak of one's ability with sincerity of purpose and determination to fulfill a life's dream—that is the success of the opportunity of America—and the mark of distinction in our society of "the self-made man." The aspirations and success of Harry Conrad Nagel in the mainstream of America's candy industry does, indeed, portray a great American success story.

We are proud to boast that Harry Nagel was born and raised in our great sovereign State of New Jersey. He was the son of German immigrants, born in Dundee Lake, N.J., January 2, 1898. The house of his birth still stands on Orchid Street in the borough now named Elmwood Park, Bergen County, N.J.

Harry is New Jersey's senior confectioner, having started his own business in West New York, N.J., in December 1921. He was a bookkeeper for the Hackensack Water Co., before joining the Homemade Candy Co., of New Jersey as a salesman. He sold more candy than they could produce and that is when he started his own company to fill the balance of the orders. As the members of the Homemade Candy Co., retired and finally closed their doors, Harry was in full swing as a leading entrepreneur in the art of a confectioner. He would load his pickup truck as a route man 3 days a week and called on stores throughout northern New Jersey and New York City.

After World War II, the mode of business changed. With the coming of home freezers and refrigerators, the homemade candy and ice cream stores started to disappear and Harry seeing this trend decided to move to the highways. He opened his first store in Wayne, N.J., followed by a second in Randolph, N.J. Both stores were instantly successful. It is interesting to note that his first confectioner's shop in West New York is still in operation. At the age of 83, Harry decided it was time to retire and turned the business over to his son Robert although old

habits are hard to break and Harry still visits his candy stores regularly.

Harry Conrad Nagel has attained excellence and national prominence in the compounding, mixing, and preparation of delightful taste treats. He received two distinguished service awards from the New Jersey Confectioners in December 1975 and February 1982 in recognition of more than a half century of outstanding expertise and dedication to our State's candy manufacturing industry.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much that could be said of the friendship and good will that Harry Nagel has so willingly and abundantly given over these many years that mean so much to the lives of all of us who have had the good fortune to know him.

As we join together in a birthday celebration to a good friend and distinguished citizen, we extend the appreciation of the Congress to Harry for his outstanding contribution to the quality of life and way of life here in America. We do, indeed, salute a great American, the Honorable Harry Conrad Nagel of Wayne, N.J.●

**APPOINTMENT OF RICHARD  
STILL AS GENERAL COUNSEL  
OF BANKING, FINANCE AND  
URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

#### HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the appointment of Richard L. Still to the position of General Counsel of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, effective immediately.

In addition to serving as General Counsel, Mr. Still will continue as staff director of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation, and Insurance, a position he has held since 1973.

A graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, Mr. Still received his LL.B. in 1957 and his LL.M. in 1960 from Georgetown University. He served as Chief Counsel and Commissioner of the Community Facilities Administration during the period 1962-66, and assumed his present position after service with the House Government Operations Committee, during which time he directed investigations of the operations of the Federal Housing Administration and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.●

# THE PEDESTRIAN HAD NO IDEA WHAT DIRECTION TO GO, SO I RAN OVER HIM

**HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTTEL**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. HEFTTEL. Mr. Speaker, our good friend and former colleague, the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce, recently forwarded to my attention a very amusing article on bureaucracy and our seeming inability to master its various intricacies. The article discusses the trials and tribulations of relating to an insurance company the details of an unfortunate automobile accident. Many of us have experienced the frustration of an accident and the subsequent anxiety of reporting it. I offer the following article which recently appeared in the San Francisco Herald Examiner as an aside, a moment of humor for our colleagues. I hope that you will find it as amusing as I did. The article follows:

THE PEDESTRIAN HAD NO IDEA WHAT DIRECTION TO GO, SO I RAN OVER HIM  
(By Neal Leavitt)

Thousands of drivers nationwide have been involved in automobile accidents and the insurance rigamarole that follows afterwards. Filling out the myriad and often confusing insurance claim forms can befuddle even the most stalwart semanticist. The following are actual excerpts culled from various auto insurance company files in Northern and Southern California:

Coming home, I drove into the wrong house and collided with a tree I don't have. The other car collided with mine without giving warning of its intentions. I thought my window was down but I found out it was up when I put my hand through it. I collided with a stationary truck coming the other way. A truck backed through my windshield into my wife's face. A pedestrian hit me and went under my car. The guy was all over the road: I had to swerve a number of times before I hit him. I pulled away from the side of the road, glanced at my mother-in-law and headed over the embankment.

In my attempt to kill a fly, I drove into a telephone pole. I had been shopping for plants all day, and was on my way home. As I reached an intersection a hedge sprang up obscuring my vision. I did not see the other car. I had been driving my car for 40 years when I felt asleep at the wheel and had an accident. I was on my way to the doctors with rear end trouble when my universal joint gave way causing me to have an accident. My car was legally parked as it backed into the other vehicle. To avoid hitting the bumper of the car in front of me I struck the pedestrian.

I was unable to stop in time and my car crashed into the other vehicle. The driver and passengers then left immediately for a vacation with injuries.

As I approached the intersection a stop sign suddenly appeared at a place where no stop sign had ever appeared before. I was unable to stop in time to avoid the accident.

An invisible car came out of nowhere and struck my vehicle—and vanished.

I told the police that I was not injured, but on removing my hat I found that I had a skull fracture.

I was sure that the old fellow would never make it to the other side of the roadway when I struck him.

The pedestrian had no idea what direction to go, so I ran over him.

I saw the slow moving, sad faced old gentleman as he bounced off my car.

The indirect cause of this accident was a little guy in a small car with a big mouth.

I was thrown from my car as it left the road. I was later found in a ditch by some stray cows.

The telephone pole was approaching fast. I was attempting to swerve out of its path when it struck my front end.

And you wonder why it takes weeks, sometimes months to receive restitution from automobile insurance companies? It takes them that long to decipher what their clients are trying to tell them!●

## CURBING SKYROCKETING NATURAL GAS PRICES; CONGRESS MUST ACT NOW

**HON. DOUG WALGREN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with my colleagues testimony I gave to the House Subcommittee on Fossil and Synthetic Fuels on the need for Congress to act promptly to hold down natural gas prices.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before your subcommittee today and want to commend you and the subcommittee members on the thorough job you have done in exploring the causes of skyrocketing natural gas prices—a problem which will vitally affect millions of Americans this winter.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, it is clear to me that we need to take immediate action, before we adjourn, so that we can moderate the high gas prices predicted for the winter months. If we fail to act, there will be thousands of people literally forced to choose between feeding their families or heating their homes.

As a Representative from Allegheny County, Pa., I represent an area especially hard hit by the natural gas crisis. High energy prices have a double impact on Pennsylvania. Not only do they raise the cost of living beyond the reach of many, but, because they hamper economic recovery, we lose more jobs.

Our heating bills in Pennsylvania are unusually high for three reasons. First, our winter climate is 20 percent colder than the national average. When you are one-fifth colder than the rest of the Nation, you obviously can expect to need at least one-fifth more heat to keep warm.

Second, we in Pennsylvania are especially dependent on natural gas and other fossil fuels for heat. Our low-income households are heavily dependent on natural gas with over one-half of these residents using gas for heating. Oil provides the heat for one-third of these households.

Finally, energy prices in the northeast are substantially above the U.S. average. For natural gas, Pennsylvanians pay at least \$3 more per 100 therms than the national average. Pennsylvanians in the three largest

metropolitan areas—Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Scranton-Wilkes-Barre—pay above one-fifth more on average for natural gas than do residents in major cities in the South.

Since November of 1978, residents of Pennsylvania's three largest cities have seen natural gas prices rise, on average, by 70 percent.

Financial advisors used to say that no more than 29 percent of your pay should be needed to finance your home. Today, it takes 29 percent of your income to pay your heating bills. In my home area of Pittsburgh, the three major gas companies are projecting to increase their rates by up to 25 percent, with the average gas bill for the month of January expected to be \$146.

There could be no worse time for this economic shock. The Pittsburgh area has 135,000 people out of work with no hope of employment before the spring, and that does not count those forced to take part-time jobs or those who have given up looking for work. Under the best of conditions, an unemployed steelworker collecting maximum benefits in Pennsylvania brings home \$728 a month. After paying the gas bill, that leaves only \$145 a week to pay the mortgage, buy food and clothing, and meet family medical bills.

What about the elderly poor in Pennsylvania? An elderly widow, living independently and totally dependent on SSI, receives \$316 a month. If she heats with gas, her January energy bill will total 46 percent of her income, leaving only \$39 a week for her other expenses.

There are those who argue that these high prices are necessary to reflect the true cost of energy in a free market and that the answer is to expand energy assistance programs to help the poor meet these bills.

Certainly we need a strong energy assistance program. The business-sponsored Committee for Economic Development has estimated that \$5 billion is a sufficient approximation of the need for this program. But, regrettably, the Reagan administration, instead of increasing the funding for energy assistance, has repeatedly tried to hold low income energy assistance below \$1.5 billion, less than one-third of what is needed.

And even with a strong low-income energy assistance program, it is important to understand that these rising gas prices are destroying the budgets of middle-class families as well as the poor and elderly. Middle-income families do not qualify for energy assistance.

Second, the current gas prices are a perversion of the free market and not a fair reflection of supply and demand. As other witnesses have pointed out, the take-or-pay contracts made several years ago locked pipeline companies into buying the most expensive gas—even when cheap gas is either burned off or vented into the air. Demand is down; supply has increased. It should follow that prices fall; but they do not.

The legislation we are supporting here today, the Temporary Natural Gas Market Correction Act of 1982, gets to the root of one of the problems by forcing major gas pipelines to renegotiate take-or-pay contracts and offer the least cost mix of gas to distribution companies. This legislation, developed by the Northeast-Midwest Coalition, is important emergency legislation that must be considered and approved quickly if it is to help hold down gas prices in cold climates this winter.

I hope this subcommittee and the Full Energy and Commerce Committee will act



during this session. It is already cold in our part of the Nation, and we simply cannot wait until a new Congress gets organized in late January and early February.●

#### EXPLANATION OF VOTE

### HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I voted "Present" during the vote on final passage of H.R. 3191, tax deductions for cruise ship conventions. I have an interest in one hotel and have an option to acquire a second. Both of these hotels conduct extensive business with conventions and, consequently, I thought it would be a conflict of interest to vote any other way on this matter.●

#### TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

### HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1982

● Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to BOB MOLLOHAN, a loyal and valued member of the Committee on Armed Services for many years and an old friend.

Bob was first elected to the Committee on Armed Services in 1954 during his second term in the House. He served with us during the 84th Congress and then left to run for Governor of West Virginia. Upon his return to the Congress in 1969, Bob was once again elected to our committee. During the intervening 14 years, he has been one of our most dedicated supporters of national defense legislation. We have always been able to count on him for guidance and advice. And we have known that in a tight situation Bob is always there to support the committee.

I believe that at one time or another he has served on all of our subcommittees. Most recently, I have been privileged to have him as the ranking member of the Research and Development Subcommittee where he has generously assisted us with his knowledge and experience.

Bob is also the ranking member of our Seapower and Investigations Subcommittee. His many years of service on the Seapower Subcommittee have given him a vast knowledge of the Navy and its needs. He has worked diligently on behalf of a Navy that is second to none. I believe that much of our recent success in modernizing and enlarging the Navy can be attributed to his tireless efforts.

While he has left his mark on many military programs, perhaps Bob's

greatest achievement was in the improvement of defense communications, command and control. In 1969 he was assigned by Mendel Rivers to chair an examination of Department of Defense communications. In that Congress and in the next three, Congresses, Bob conducted a thorough examination of defense communications and command-control (C<sup>3</sup>) systems. The reports of his subcommittee's examination are referred to in the C<sup>3</sup> community as the Mollohan reports. Those reports are considered the dawn of congressional recognition of the critical importance of C<sup>3</sup>. Communicators also credit the Mollohan reports with awakening the military services to the necessity of improving C<sup>3</sup> in order to realize the full potential of our weapons systems. Senior C<sup>3</sup> personnel in the Armed Forces trace most of the significant improvements in their system during the past decade to the determination of Bob to provide the forces with reliable, responsive C<sup>3</sup> equipment. It is their consensus that the capabilities of our defenses have been vastly improved as a result of his efforts to identify deficiencies and to obtain funding for their correction.

We will also miss Bob, and his wife Helen, on our committee travels. We have always enjoyed their company. In those travels Bob has always been very interested in learning of the living conditions of our troops overseas as well as their equipment needs. He has used that knowledge to bring about an improvement in the troops' quality of life and to improve and modernize their weapons and equipment.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for all of our committee members on both sides of the aisle when I wish Bob and Helen many happy years of retirement.●

#### WESTERN HEMISPHERE CONFERENCE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS ON POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT

### HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, between December 2 and 5, I was privileged to represent the House at the Western Hemisphere Conference of Parliamentarians on Population and Development in Brasilia, Brazil.

In the course of the 4-day agenda, I was called upon to deliver some remarks on the immigration problems between the United States and Latin American countries.

A copy of those remarks is attached.

#### ADDRESS TO THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE CONFERENCE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS ON POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT DECEMBER 3, 1982

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the host Government of Brazil, and the Brazilian Parliamentary Group for organizing and hosting this first Western Hemisphere Conference of Parliamentarians on Population and Development.

I am particularly glad that Mr. Bustamante of Mexico was able to be with us today. Many of us in the United States recognize him as the leading expert, in this hemisphere on the subject of immigration between Latin American countries and the United States.

It is simply outstanding that countries and more than 20 international and government organizations are represented in this hall here today. The fact that more than 90 parliamentarians have agreed to discuss these issues demonstrates real hope for our future cooperation in their solution.

VAZ DA COSTA

I particularly appreciated Mr. Vaz Da Costa's challenge yesterday—that when executive branches of government fear to act or do not wish to act, parliamentarians should do so. In all of the major U.S. initiatives for family planning it has been the Congress, not the executive branch, which has provided the leadership. Our major population legislation for example was led by Senator Tydings and our present Vice President George Bush who was then a Member of our House of Representatives.

The population explosion in Latin America and the Caribbean that started more than 30 years ago is now taking its toll on the region's ability to modernize and develop. According to the United Nations Latin American Demographic Center (CELADE), the population of Latin America and the Caribbean is projected to more than double from 208 million in 1960 to 545 million in the year 2000.

The consequences of this drastic population increase becomes evident when we consider a comparison drawn by Robert Fox of the Inter-American Development Bank. He said: In its best year since World War II, from 1945 to 1977 the United States created 4 million jobs, but Latin America, with perhaps one-fifth of the economic base of the United States must from now to the end of the century annually create 4 million jobs, just in order not to fall behind in its present high rate of unemployment. This seems literally impossible if the present rate of population growth in many countries continues.

Population growth seems therefore to be one of the main causes of the poverty, under development, high levels of unemployment, and political instability that ignite internal and external migration in the hemisphere. It also can prevent human immigration policies. Consideration of new immigration policy has become a priority item on the political agenda of many industrialized nations, and is also emerging as a critical concern of many developing countries. It is an issue that affects most of us in this room.

For some of us here, massive migration means the loss of our best talent, the loss of time and effort that was employed in educating and training our most intelligent and industrious people, and the imposition of limitations on our development potential. For others of us, it means increased competition in our labor markets in the face of unprecedented levels of unemployment and severe economic difficulties. I think we must

accept a basic fact. When good people cannot find jobs in their own country, they will undertake almost incredible hardships to migrate to countries where they can find work. No law that we can pass in the United States or any other country can stop this basic human desire and action to achieve a better life.

Traditionally, the United States has been known as a willing recipient of successive waves of immigrants from different parts of the world. In recent years, more than 600,000 legal immigrants and refugees have been admitted for permanent residence in the United States annually. Furthermore, between 1 and 2 million illegal immigrants a year are estimated to be flowing into the United States, 200,000 to 500,000 of whom stay.

Our current economic uncertainty in the United States is aggravated by record unemployment rates of more than 10 percent. Under these conditions there is an understandable adverse public reaction against recent waves of immigrants. This, in turn, affects the ability of policymakers to develop a rational and humane immigration policy.

The countries of Latin America have every right to hope that the United States will seek to reduce deficit spending and high interest rates. To do this the United States must seek to find jobs for its own people, since our high unemployment is the direct cause of both our deficit spending and our high interest rates. To assist the economies of Latin American countries by reducing our own unemployment therefore, many of our people argue that we should take strong action against the present flow of illegal workers into the United States and to legitimize the rights of people from Latin American countries whose labor contributes to our economy.

Presidents Carter and Reagan both appointed task forces to study immigration problem. Many of the recommendations of these task forces are reflected in a major immigration bill, known as the Simpson-Mazzoli bill, now pending before Congress. This legislation would grant amnesty to millions of illegal aliens who are already in the United States, while imposing severe penalties on employers who hire illegal immigrants in the future. The proposal also calls for substantial increases in the immigration ceilings for Mexican nationals and the upgrading of immigration law enforcement.

The legislation has been referred to several committees in the House and Senate, and has been subjected to more than 100 hours of hearings at which more than 300 witnesses testified. Whether this legislation will be enacted into law is hard to predict. Mr. Porter and I will welcome advice from each of you in these next few days as we may have a vote on this issue when we return to Washington next week.

A comprehensive response to the immigration issue requires both an international approach and dealing with the root of the problem: The high rates of population growth and the poverty, political chaos, and underdevelopment which are enhanced by such growth.

It is clearly in the interest of sending and receiving countries alike to cooperate in the development of both comprehensive migration and population programs. What you do in your respective countries and what we do in the United States is a matter on which we parliamentarians should try to agree upon if possible.

Through regional conferences like this one, we Americans hope for once to be lis-

tening to you rather than talking. We hope to coordinate our programs with yours. Hopefully this conference will help us immensely in laying the ground work for future cooperation between our respective parliaments.

The key to addressing the problem is of course for the United States to help in promoting the long-term economic, social, and political development of people-exporting countries. President Reagan's Caribbean Basin Initiative, a series of measures in the areas of trade, aid and investment, is a start, but we think there are two other things we can do and should do.

First, we will try to continue to do all we can to assist national and international organizations in collecting information and conducting research on international migration and other population-related matters. Lester Brown's world watch information that he gave us yesterday morning is typical of the kind of information that can change parliamentarians' thinking and lead to major changes in national policy.

Second, we believe we should continue to assist you in any programs you devise to permit couples to choose the number of their offspring. Our population assistance, directly and indirectly to Latin American countries today totals approximately \$75 million a year. During hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, which Mr. Barnes has the honor of chairing, he was able to obtain the commitment of the Reagan administration to continued support of population programs despite our overall deficits which, for the first time in our history, have exceeded \$100 billion per year in the past 2 years.

To the extent that Latin American parliaments adopt effective programs of family planning, I think you can be assured of continuing U.S. assistance both from our Government and our private organizations. Most of us in the U.S. Congress would far prefer to vote for population assistance to your countries than for military assistance.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, since I am recuperating from surgery and under doctor's orders, I was not able to be present for several of the votes on H.R. 5133, "Fair Practices in Automotive Products Act." I would therefore like to take this opportunity to state for the record how I would have voted had I been present.

Rollcall No. 457: An amendment that sought to define the purposes of the bill as the following: to reduce competition in the automotive industry, protect jobs in one industry to the detriment of jobs in other industries, and to increase the price of automobiles to consumers; I would have voted "nay."

Rollcall No. 458: An amendment, as amended, that sought to exempt Japanese automobile manufacturers from requirements if the balance of trade deficit with Japan declined based on

the ratio of the automotive products balance of trade to the deficit in goods and services; I would have voted "nay."

Rollcall No. 459: An amendment that provided that nothing in the bill should be deemed to supersede the terms or conditions of any treaty, international convention, or agreement on tariffs and trade in existence on the date of enactment to which the United States is party; I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall No. 460: Passage of H.R. 5133 to establish a domestic content requirement for motor vehicles sold in the United States; I would have voted "nay." ●

#### TEDDY GLEASON, PRESIDENT OF THE ILA SPEAKS OUT AGAINST PROTECTIONISM

#### HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, Thomas W. "Teddy" Gleason, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO, is a statesman of the American labor movement. No one understands better the anxiety of American workers whose jobs are subject to international economic markets. And no one understands better why, in the interest of preserving and creating American jobs, we must refrain from shortsighted "quick fixes" like the domestic content bill which Congress has debated this week.

Today, in testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee, Teddy Gleason outlined the reasons why the domestic content legislation is a bad idea—

not because it is ill meant but because it is ill-conceived. It is a fragmentary approach that will complicate our own responses, hamstring our negotiators and create far more dust than it can settle.

The issue of fair trade in other markets is a fair issue, he argues persuasively, but our response must be—

in the context of an overall reconciliation of conflicting national and international policies and interests. \* \* \* In a sense, all American labor and industry today is in the same vulnerable boat. We have to stay afloat together, not separately and certainly not by going our own ways. We must all pull together in supporting our trade bargainers. That's how the job will get done the right way, not, as this bill will tend to do, the wrong way.

This is excellent advice, and I commend this excellent testimony to my colleagues.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THOMAS W. GLEASON, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION, AFL-CIO

Gentlemen: My name is Thomas W. Gleason. I am the International President of the International Longshoremen's Association,



AFL-CIO. The ILA represents over 100,000 longshoremen and employees in other occupations affecting—and affected by—domestic and international trade.

The ILA can appreciate the motives and responses of S. 2300, The Fair Practices In Automotive Products Act. It is an attempt to seek relief for an important home industry that is facing rapidly increasing competition, in particular, from the Japanese auto industry.

I submit that the solution that that industry seeks, through passage of the bill before you, is not the appropriate or most effective answer to a serious problem. It attempts to handle the situation on an ad hoc basis, without ample consideration of the impact on our country and its trade relations as a whole and the implications for other American industries as well.

The longshore industry is a case in point. Over the past two decades, the results of automation and the adverse actions of federal agencies have eliminated many millions of longshoreman-hours and thousands of jobs on the waterfront. In their wake, all sorts of additional jobs in backup industries such as trucking, warehousing, insurance, processing and so on which depend for their very existence on shorefront activities, at a ratio of about five backup positions for every longshoreman, have disappeared.

If the intended effects of S. 2300 actually come to pass, then we foresee extensive loss of international cargo which our members handle, to be followed by raised tariffs, cuts in foreign shipments of American products, and other retaliatory measures. These will further erode whatever work remains in the already hard-pressed longshore and shipping industries.

This piece of legislation, though it seems narrowly-addressed and confined to a single industry, will be used as a precedent to open the door to similar bills yet to be sponsored on behalf of industries that also face trouble because of over-reaching and inequitable trade practices. It will not be long before we conduct our international trade by congressional statutes written in stone, rather than through flexible negotiations and the selective uses of economic power. This traditionally and for pragmatic reasons has been the province of the Executive branch of government, which conducts our day-to-day foreign relations.

In the case of the Japanese, the measure before you will aggravate and harden the situation, rather than seek changes thru persuasion and appeals to self-interest. We all know that trade with Japan has become too much of a one-way proposition. It hasn't only been limited to automobiles; it encompasses full or partial bans on a whole range of American products that are not permitted to meet the existing and potential demands of the Japanese consumer market, so that Japan's balance of trade—but not ours—artificially remains favorable.

Japan, like other governments who perform the same trick, must be made to understand we will not deal piece-meal with them like they do with us. American industry and the American economy is an integrated one. Whether it be autos, or farm products, or steel, or computers or services, there are ripple effects elsewhere within our system. The example that I gave you of the potential effects of this bill on our own industry can be multiplied a hundred or a thousand fold when one considers the actions of—and counteractions to—Japanese trade policies. The time for action is upon us!

What we need, then, is a broad—not a limited—approach to the underlying problem. It really has to do with Japanese and other foreign attitudes that overprotect and subsidize their constituents, while seeing American industry and consumers as ripe for the picking. That is the type of "foreign aid" you don't—possibly can't—legislate, unless we're going to go back to those days when we were an "island republic". The President, through his Trade Representative, is the appropriate party to drive the message home to our trading partners: that protection and invasion are not the answer; rather, responsible, even-handed trade policies are the only way to keep all of our economies in balance if the Free World is to stick together and succeed.

I therefore urge you table this bill, not because it is ill meant but because it is ill conceived. It is a fragmentary approach that will complicate our own responses, hamstring our negotiators and create far more dust than it can settle.

This does not mean that the basic problem is to be swept under the rug. To the very contrary! It is precisely because the proponents and supporters of this bill have felt the need to go to such great lengths to remedy what they and our own members see as a festering and growing adversity, that the Administration must devote more strenuous efforts and determination to rectify it through the means at their disposal.

We in the ILA intend to do whatever may be required of us to back up the Administration's posture in bringing these matters to a head. It must be done in the context of an overall reconciliation of conflicting national and international policies and interests.

As Ambassador Brock commented in his statement regarding the corresponding House bill:

"[The Fair Practices In Automotive Products Act] is another manifestation of an affliction that Americans what left behind—the easy answer. They are tired of "quick solutions", that invariably become non-solutions resulting from simplistic analysis of problems. Increased import share is not the problem, but rather a symptom of a decline in U.S. international competitiveness. The answer to this real problem is that management, labor, and the Government must take those actions, separately and together, that improve productivity, that reduce costs, that encourage economic investment, and that put us on a level playing field with respect to our major trading partners.

"In contrast, the passage of [The Fair Practices In Automotive Products Act] creates new problems. It would be viewed as both a renunciation of reciprocal trade liberalization policy, currently being pursued by this Administration, and a revocation of free trade policy that has been supported by all Administrations and Congresses for over 30 years."

In a sense, all American labor and industry today is in the same vulnerable boat. We have to stay afloat together, not separately and certainly not by going our own ways. We must all pull together in supporting our trade bargainers. That's how the job will get done the right way, not, as this bill will tend to do, the wrong way.

Thank you for inviting me to present our position on this important matter.●

## TRIBUTE TO JACK BRINKLEY

### HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as the gavel sounds for the adjournment of the 97th Congress, it will mean the loss of the experience and talents of a number of our most able colleagues.

JACK THOMAS BRINKLEY is one of those persons. Had JACK chosen, he could have spent many more years in public life with great challenges and honors awaiting him. But he has chosen to retire at the end of this Congress to devote more time to his family and the private practice of law. Although I understand the personal reasons behind his decision to bring his House service to a close, I am deeply saddened at his departure.

JACK has served unselfishly and with distinction as a member of the Armed Services Committee since his election to the 90th Congress. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, he has worked tirelessly to upgrade the living and working conditions of the men and women in uniform and their dependents. Under his leadership, new and innovative technologies have been introduced in the construction of military facilities and military family housing with good results. Significant cost savings to the taxpayers have been realized because of his initiative and concern.

JACK has always stood for the finest qualities in our humanity: Integrity, courage, tenacity, ability, and dedication. He belongs, first of all to Georgia; but the entire Nation is richer because of his unselfish and excellent service during 16 years in the Congress.

I wish to extend to JACK and his family my sincere best wishes for the future as well as my thanks for diligent service in the past.●

## AMERICAN STRATEGIES FOR PRODUCTIVITY AND PROFITABILITY

### HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, to say that our Nation suffers under the weight of a serious productivity dilemma is to belabor the obvious. The inability of our economy to achieve real growth is, in great measure, due to the failure of the Government, the business community, labor, academia, and citizens at large to recognize that productivity improvement, in all its di-

mensions, is an integral factor in lowering inflation, increasing profits, and returning people to their jobs.

One of the most perceptive individuals to comprehend the enormity of our productivity problems is Thomas J. Murrin, president of Westinghouse Corp. Public System's Co. In a truly superb speech delivered at Fordham University, Mr. Murrin outlines the reasons for our productivity dilemma, the impact it has on our economy and international competitiveness and, most importantly, what we as individuals and as a nation need to do in order to solve our productivity problems.

A year and a half ago, I traveled to Japan with Tom Murrin on a tour of Japanese industry sponsored by the American Productivity Center. I benefited greatly from his perceptiveness on the productivity issue. I know that our colleagues will also benefit greatly from Tom Murrin's insights if they take a few moments to read his important remarks:

The remarks follow:

**AMERICAN STRATEGIES FOR PRODUCTIVITY AND PROFITABILITY**

Thank you—and good evening, ladies and gentleman.

It is a pleasure and privilege for me to participate in this Sievers Memorial Lecture Series.

As we enter the decade of the '80s, an increasing number of discerning Americans grow more concerned about our prospects—as a nation—of being able to come to grips with the economic and industrial challenges that we are facing.

Our country is poised on the brink of a major industrial and economic crisis—brought on by more than a decade of low capital investment; limited R&D spending; high labor demands; and too little management attention to productivity and quality improvement—to cite just a few factors. This has been encouraged by a myriad of federal laws and regulations which have inhibited capital formation—and constitute an implicit industrial policy that has led to a disastrous decline in U.S. productivity.

In addition, this industrial and economic crisis makes much more difficult the concurrent revitalization of our national security, military capabilities—necessary to counter the growing Soviet military and political threats. But that is a separate subject...

As you probably are aware, the growth rate of America's industrial productivity slowed down in the '70s—and came to a screeching halt at the end of the decade. Our productivity actually declined a couple of points in 1981.

As a result, we as a nation are steadily becoming non-competitive in much of the world market place.

During this same period, productivity kept rising in most other industrial nations—and particularly in the Far East. Consequently, some foreign companies which could once survive only in their protected home markets can now compete with American industry everywhere—including our home markets here in the United States.

The challenge to American industry—and consequently to the American economy, and our people's security and prosperity—is awe-

some. In industries in which America was preeminent—steel, ship-building, automobiles, consumer electronics—our leadership has been stripped away.

To help calibrate you on this challenge, let me cite the following information from a recently published report, which we've verified with our own analysis—concerning a product that we're all familiar with; the automobile: "Ford Motor Company's better plants turn out an average of two engines a day per employee using 777 square feet of space; the plants have up to three weeks of backup inventory, and use over 200 labor classifications. In contrast, a Toyota plant turns out nine engines a day per employee, or more than four times as many as Ford's; it uses only 454 square feet of plant space per engine, or less than 60 percent of Ford's. A Toyota plant has only one hour of backup inventory and only seven labor classifications, less than 4 percent of Ford's".

Of crucial concern to industry, and the future health of much more of our American economy—is the current targeting by the Japanese of micro-electronics, computers, communications, machine tools, and robots—as the next industries for Japanese world dominance.

In regard to robots, for example, Japan has in place several times the number of robots as the United States—and is far in advance of the rest of the world.

By 1981, they had installed over 60,000 robots—while we in the United States have installed about 4,000.

There are now over 200 companies in Japan producing robots. Last year they produced some 24 thousand—and they expect to double that this year. Their typical robot producer is apparently planning to triple production over the next four to five years—suggesting output by then to be 150 to 200 thousand robots per year.

America must not lose these current battles for industrial supremacy—since these advanced technologies will be the foundation industries for every industrialized nation's economy for the next several decades.

While we in the United States have the technology, the people, and the other resources to meet these economic challenges, our response will probably be insufficient—if things continue on their present course.

So, doing it the same way we've always done it will no longer be sufficient!

Consequently—during the last three and a half years—we at Westinghouse have been studying extensively the "behind the scenes" reasons for the progress of many Japanese companies.

One of the most important lessons we've learned from these studies is that management must be willing to discard outmoded business practices—and embrace new ideas.

Consequently, we are successfully adapting much of what we have learned—and combining what we adapt with some of our own innovations, to keep our business healthy, and to establish productivity and quality improvement as a way of life throughout the corporation.

We have established six fundamental strategies for the improvement of our performance...

Three of these strategies are coequal. The first is to improve the management and motivation of our people—with particular emphasis on getting our people involved in the identification and solution of problems, through a participative management approach. Second is the introduction of new technology in both the office and the factory. And the critical third strategy is quality

improvement—which must permeate the implementation of all our other strategies.

Note that quality improvement has equal emphasis! It is the quality of their products that has given the Japanese a strategic advantage in world markets—not just their productivity. It appears to me that many of their productivity improvements are actually byproducts of their emphasis on quality. That is, by literally "doing it right the first time", they don't waste resources fixing it, and this automatically improves productivity.

Productivity improvement, in its broadest sense, means improving the way we use all business resources—people's knowledge and labor; technology; energy; raw materials; plant and equipment; money, and time.

Our final three strategies address this broad definition of productivity...

Our fourth strategy is to increasingly apply the techniques of value analysis to improve our products, processes, services and organizations. The fifth strategy is to improve the utilization of all our resources—including energy, raw materials and money. And the sixth strategy is what Peter Drucker calls "transnational production"—that is, strategically locating our new manufacturing facilities, particularly our feeder facilities, around the world, in a way that reduces our product costs, and improves our access to world markets.

In my view, this is the most challenging and promising program that we have ever undertaken. It may also be the most important!

Similar progress must be made throughout American industry! Equally important, an effort from every segment of our society is needed to stimulate our national productivity.

Encouragingly, more and more voices from the boardrooms of Corporate America are speaking out. We see interest in productivity on our college and university campuses—and an ever increasing number of the nation's labor leaders are beginning to talk about it. Even the federal government has begun to acknowledge the problem—and to ponder their role in improving quality and productivity.

A recent study by Yankelovich, Skelly and White found that "the problem of the Japanese challenge to American industry arouses more concern among America's leaders than any social or economic issue that has been investigated by their organization in over 20 years."

The challenge would be grave enough if it were viewed simply as traditional competition in which production capability, management skill, and market forces largely determine the outcome.

But the Japanese challenge poses fundamental questions about the way we do business—about business and government relations, and about several features of our society, and the American character.

In other words, meeting the Japanese challenge is beyond the reach of any one company or industry—though company and industry efforts are certainly essential. In my judgment, even if every major corporation in the United States were to undertake programs to improve their productivity and their competitiveness, their efforts would not suffice against Japan's National Industrial Policy.

The goal of the Japanese has for sometime been to catch, and then surpass all others in economic performance. They have created a strategy and a set of institutional relationships to implement it—a cooperative



relationship among industry, government, labor, and academe and an organization, MITI, to orchestrate the process. As if the economic success of this system to date were not proof enough of its effectiveness compared to the American system, recent studies in South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore indicate that it is the Japanese—not the American—model that is being emulated by these newly industrialized countries.

Our competitive model is no longer being copied—because, to a worrisome extent, it has been rendered obsolete!

These East Asian countries—without significant natural resources—have achieved rapid growth by developing efficient, specialized manufacturing organizations backed by a system of social and economic incentives designed to promote work, savings, risk taking, investment, and labor mobility. They have achieved success by better organizing human and financial resources. Their rapid industrialization has grown out of an economic strategy designed to promote productivity, and international competitiveness.

Their game plan is national economic growth; their strategy is worldwide preeminence in selected industries—and their facilitating mechanism is a relationship among industry, government, labor, and academe that is fundamentally different from our American counterpart. We are being surpassed by a political/economic system that creates growth, strength, and wealth for a nation's economy—and thereby promises to provide for an improved prosperity, and standard-of-living for its people.

This game plan is well described in the new book, "The East Asia Edge". I support former Ambassador Reischauer's commentary on this book—which I quote: "Americans have become accustomed to the concept of Japan as no. 1", as Ezra Vogel put it in his book. Now, Roy Hofheinz and Kent Calder have thrown us a larger and more alarming challenge; it is clear that some of Japan's smaller neighbors are capable of repeating much of the Japanese miracle. Throw in the billion people of China, and you have a quarter of the world's population set to outpace the West and the rest of the world.

"The authors' thesis is not just stimulating; it is mind boggling. This is a fascinating and deeply significant book."

Accordingly, business, government, labor and academe in America can no longer maintain an attitude of indifference toward the industrial policies of other nations—nor can our institutions any longer continue in their present roles and relationships, and expect to witness anything other than the continuing decline of American industry's productivity, and international competitiveness.

A truly effective response to our economic problems requires a unified effort by these key segments of American society. We need a national commitment—and an explicit strategy for American Productivity Improvement and International Competitiveness.

Thus, a major role by government is essential to the restoration and maintenance of America's industrial preeminence. And—as has been demonstrated by the recent comparative successes of the East Asian countries in productivity, and international competitiveness—that role must change substantially from the present governmental philosophies, policies and relationships toward business. The role of government—aimed principally as a regulator and a

watchdog of industry to "project" the people—leads to an adversarial relationship, that restricts and restrains industry, and hence, the nation's economy. This hurts—rather than protects—our people.

Our new model must recognize the responsibility of government to assure an increasing level of prosperity and standard of living for its people—and must recognize that that goal can be achieved only through a strong and growing national economy; attainable through increased industrial strength and growth. Government's role in such a process is active, cooperative, and supportive of industry.

I am not suggesting that we must copy our competition's political systems. Rather, the challenge is to find in ourselves a uniquely American response. A response that calls upon our creativity and ingenuity—to protect our standard of living, and assure our national security.

To that end, let me suggest that the role of government in a National Strategy for American Productivity Improvement and International Competitiveness should focus on fundamental changes and actions in several areas; including: a global strategy for trade and investment; technology; education and training; domestic saving and investment policy; and to achieve these, we must develop a consensus-based process for policy formulation.

Let's look at these areas individually: First, in the area of international trade and investment, recent trends have given rise to the observation that other nations export unemployment—whereas we export jobs. While tariffs have generally fallen, non-tariff barriers, investment requirements, offset demands and export incentives often fall with disproportionate severity on the U.S. economy.

The United States is too heavily engaged in the world trading system to ignore these trends. In 1980, for example, the United States exported almost one-quarter of its manufactured output, and imported over 21 percent of its manufactured consumption—more than double the percentage of ten years earlier. Consequently, trade is no longer an "also ran". The line between what is "domestic"—and what is "foreign"—is increasingly blurred. What other governments do to promote exports, and restrict investment, now impacts heavily on America's domestic economy.

The U.S. government should be applauded for intensifying its effort to break down foreign barriers to U.S. exports. But if we cannot be successful soon, then our policymakers should consider selective measures to enable our industries that are targeted by foreign industrial policies to compete fairly.

At the same time, the U.S. government should propose new negotiations aimed at establishing a set of common rules that apply to all.

In an era when export markets are becoming the world's most promising—and sometimes only—opportunities for economic growth, the United States government sometimes seems intent on dealing itself out of export opportunities abroad. For example, while other governments put together attractive financing packages in support of their exports, the U.S. government has adopted a negative attitude toward the Export-Import Bank. Studies by Wharton Econometric Forecasting Associates have estimated that for every dollar of interest differential that Exim loans out, the Federal Government gets back roughly nine to ten dollars in net revenues—and state and local

governments another four dollars—mainly through increased tax revenues from increased economic activities, and the reduction of various welfare payments.

What is needed is a binding international agreement on export financing that sets firm limits on interest rates, and the duration of loans financed by governments.

To encourage serious international negotiations, the U.S. government should meet other governments' financing offers in whatever way it takes to compete effectively. Present lending ceilings could be greatly increased, or removed entirely, with instructions to match foreign offers on an equal basis. Also, Congress could let the Ex-Im Bank compete for funds in the private sector—and appropriate only those interest-equalization funds needed to meet foreign competition.

Overall, our United States maintains more export disincentives than any other nation in the world. While many—if not all—may be justified individually, their collective effect is frightful.

Therefore, much must be done to attack these disincentives; including:

The clarification of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, so that present ambiguities do not frustrate legitimate business opportunities.

The revisitation of antitrust problems generally—with a view to examining these problems in the context of a global market where global competition exists; and,

A revisitation of the tax structure to enhance export opportunities, and stimulate U.S. participation in global markets.

Our future economic survival depends upon our increasing participation in world markets. It is imperative that we develop a global strategy for trade and investment by providing incentives which match foreign competition—and by removing the disincentives that we currently have in place.

Second, technology. While the United States leads the world in spending for basic research and development, our technological leadership has eroded in several key areas that have a profound effect on our world competitive position. The economy of a modern industrial society is driven by rapid development and application of technology in products, services and manufacturing processes.

Our major competitors include a Technology Strategy as an explicit part of their National Industrial Policy.

For example, the Japanese and the French are concentrating on aerospace, electronics, communications, robots, machine tools, and computers. These are all major industries of the United States that are driven by rapid technological evolution.

Recent history suggests that a foreign national thrust into a chosen market or technology will successfully acquire very large U.S. and world market shares from American firms competing individually.

Therefore, an American response must be formulated and implemented to ensure our competitive strength, and avoid an erosion of our national capabilities. Such a response should include:

Joint multi-firm, government-laboratory and university research ventures that have government approval—and are focused to supply basic technology to meet market requirements.

Manufacturing Technology programs to stimulate the development and deployment of advanced manufacturing techniques—as exemplified by the Department of Defense's Manufacturing Technology and Technology

Modernization programs. Through this mechanism, the government removes barriers and provides incentives for its contractors to pursue higher risk—and higher payoff—technologies. These advances result in substantial savings to the government, contribute to the national security—and help create a domestic capability that is of substantial value to the economy. And

Intelligence gathering; in which

Government—through its executive branch agencies—cooperates with industry and academe to assess the direction and nature of foreign competitive threats. This is an essential ingredient for effective executive policy and legislative initiatives—as well as business planning. Such coordinated efforts are necessary to provide the quality of information required to support successful government and business strategies.

Third, we must recognize that America's education and training system is poorly matched with the skills needed for modern U.S. occupations. While Americans are among the most educated people in the world, they are not as well-trained, in many cases, as are workers of our foreign competitors. Consequently, we are faced with a serious and growing shortage of critical scientific and vocational skills that are in high demand, and essential to improving American productivity.

The response to our education system's shortcomings ought to be similar to our response to the Sputnik launch—that is, a national effort to improve the quantity and quality of college trained engineers and scientists at all levels. Japan graduates more engineers than the U.S.—even though it has half our population. And France has decided to double its national force of computer engineers over the next four years—in response to industrial needs and opportunities.

Recently, the Nation Science Foundation reported that about 10 percent of the full-time engineering faculty positions were vacant at the beginning of the 1980-81 academic year—while the IEEE reported that more than 37 percent of the PhD engineering graduates in 1981 were not available to U.S. industries or universities because they are non-US nationals with temporary student visas. Action must be taken to upgrade faculty salaries and capital facilities for higher education in engineering and the sciences—and we must provide loans and loan guarantees, for students in engineering and the sciences.

In addition, the typical Japanese factory worker—such as those who produce the Toyotas noted earlier—has had about 30 percent more classroom hours than our workers; has passed a rigorous Japanese fluency test, and acquired the ability to read English. When first employed, he goes through a several month orientation program—and then he becomes a career-long member of a quality circle.

Obviously, we have much catching up to do in our factories—as well as our offices and laboratories.

Such efforts must be coupled with effective vocational training for those whose skills are obsolete by the application of technologically advanced manufacturing.

We need leadership, on a national scale, to formulate an effective alliance of private industry, labor and government with community colleges and vocational training schools to emulate for industry the enormous beneficial impact that the Land Grant Agricultural Colleges have had over the years. This suggests an expanded role for many commu-

nity colleges that should have a very beneficial effect on the work and personal lives of many Americans.

Local organizations—such as "Councils for Needed Skills"—could be created which would bring together educational institutions with industry and labor to develop curricula; define training equipment needs; and identify part-time faculty from industry and labor to satisfy the needs for increasing skill levels.

Assuming the other elements of our strategy are in place—including an aggressive trade policy; strategic education programs; joint R&D projects, productivity including government procurement policies and flexible anti-trust policies—we must recognize, fourthly, that the program may still fail without sufficient capital resources for the critical growth industries. While capital is available in the U.S., its availability does not necessarily coincide with the long term interests of the U.S. Economy. This problem exists for several reasons, such as:

Historically, U.S. firms have tended to focus on short-term profits. In large part, this reflects our reliance on the equity markets for capital—and our preoccupation with stock market prices.

Since World War II, the U.S. has enjoyed a technological advantage over the rest of the world—and has not had to critically examine the relationship between capital investments and its technological base; and also—

Our earlier history of long-term, real-growth meant that there was a sufficient capital supply to fund almost any venture—and apparently this has bred inattention to our current capital needs.

Our inattention to the problem of capital formation and strategic domestic investment has led to a situation where now the future of the technological and hence, industrial base of the U.S. is by no means assured. A Commerce Department study indicates that in 1980, 45 percent of all new U.S. investment in high technology plants and equipment came from foreign sources. In a sense we are losing control of our own economic destiny!

While the Economic Recovery Act of 1981 has helped with this problem, there are several other opportunities available to us . . .

Promising ways to encourage savings and capital formation include elimination of taxation on interest earned on savings—and allowances for a speedier write-off for investments in new plants and equipment.

This is demonstrated in Japan, where earned interest is tax-free—when one invests in government savings programs. This explains, in part, why the Japanese level of savings is several times ours.

Two relevant proposals recently emerged at a hearing before the Joint Economic Committee offer an opportunity to enhance the capital resources for new ventures.

One calls for a revision of federal laws governing pension funds—in relation to the Employees Retirement and Income Security Act—to permit some of the 800 billion dollars in pension funds to be invested in venture capital projects.

The GAO estimates that if only one percent of the total pension funds were made available, that would be six to eight times the total venture capital invested last year.

The second proposal would allow for "differential" capital gains tax rates. Currently, all long-term capital gains are taxed at 20 percent—whereas the proposal calls for taxing "new" business ventures held for a certain period of time—at a lower rate, or possibly not taxing them at all.

If we are to regain control of our economic destiny, then we must ensure that adequate capital resources are available.

Fifth and finally, there is virtually no disagreement that when Government, Management, Labor and Academe all work in a complementary fashion toward shared objectives, the most difficult challenges become manageable. But what is lacking are effective mechanisms to bring the leaders of these facets of society together, on neutral ground—in pursuit of common goals.

Therefore, we encourage the Executive Branch to adopt a Consensus-Based Policy Formulation Mechanism—to provide leadership in resolving issues on which there is a broad agreement that solutions must be developed and implemented.

For example, the retraining and relocating of displaced workers is the kind of high priority problem that requires the concerted and coordinated effort of Industry, Labor, Government, and Academe. It is an issue on which industry, labor, government, and academic policies and actions must be cooperatively devised—and carefully coordinated.

This is an issue that has near universal consent on the need for action—but no consensus yet on the appropriate actions. There are approximately fifty bills in the Congress to address aspects of the current dichotomy of having critical shortages of skilled workers in some industries—while tens of thousands of workers from other industries swell the ranks of the unemployed.

To this end, a legitimate and necessary role for the Cabinet Council on Economic Affairs—in close cooperation with industry, labor and academe—would be to assist in the adjustments from mature and declining industries into new and emerging opportunities.

A Consensus-Based Policy Formulation pilot project should be initiated to develop a detailed and comprehensive set of recommendations for Executive policy, legislation, industrial and academic initiative. The project could begin by soliciting the full participation of the major labor organizations, the major industrial organizations, the principal associations of academic institutions; and the involved departments of government, and their oversight committees in Congress.

Such a Policy Formulation Task Force—with expertise from these organizations—has the capability to effectively integrate the political and economic needs, and constraints, of all effected segments of society.

This specific training and education project could be the first in a series of efforts to formulate a national consensus on issues that require national attention and action.

These are some of the key things that we as a nation need to do to effectively mobilize our resources in the face of today's economic challenges.

These then are "American strategies for productivity and profitability".

If we take such actions soon, we can regain our position of economic leadership during this decade—and the United States of America will be healthy, vibrant, and secure, once again.

Thank you.

#### SOURCES

Scientific American, October, 1982.

Kent Calder and Roy Hofheinz, *The Eastasia Edge*, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1982.



Bruce R. Scott, "Can Industry Survive the Welfare State," *Harvard Business Review*, September-October, 1982.

Meeting Japan's Challenge: The Need for Leadership, A Study of American Leader's Opinions on the Japanese Challenge to American Industry. Study conducted for Motorola Inc. by Yankelovich, Skelly and White, Inc., 1982.

Peter G. Peterson, "The U.S. Competitive Position in the 1980's—and Something We Might Do About It." *The Global Studies*, The Center for International Business, March, 1982.●

#### TRIBUTE TO MR. JOHN HOOVER

##### HON. GREGORY W. CARMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. CARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give special commendation to Mr. John Hoover, an exceptional member of the American Embassy in Tokyo, Japan. Mr. Hoover recently assisted me during a special factfinding mission on behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives Banking Committee to promote international trade.

I was very impressed by the organization of the American Embassy in Tokyo. Through Mr. Hoover's efforts my meetings with trade officials in the public and private sectors in Japan were very successful.

Sharing with you a little of Mr. Hoover's history is my pleasure. He was born in Florida in 1945. He holds degrees from the University of Kansas. Mr. Hoover has served in the U.S. General Accounting Office, in the Consular Office in Ecuador and presently holds the post of economic officer in the American Embassy in Tokyo.

Mr. John Hoover's exceptional efforts bring credit to himself, the American Embassy in Tokyo, and to the United States. We are truly fortunate to have him as a member of the U.S. Foreign Service.●

#### A VOTE OF THANKS TO MAINE POTATO GROWERS FROM THE STEEL TOWNS OF PENNSYLVANIA

##### HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the unemployed steelworkers and all citizens in my 18th District in western Pennsylvania, I want to express our thanks to the Maine potato industry and the Northern Maine Family Farm Core for donating 90,000 pounds of Maine potatoes to unemployed steelworkers in Pittsburgh.

This Saturday, hundreds of Pittsburgh steel families will be able to re-

ceive 10-pound bags of potatoes at Three Rivers Stadium because of the generosity of these potato growers in Maine. With 135,000 Pittsburgh area residents now out of work and with little hope for economic recovery, this assistance is very much needed and welcomed.

The American steel industry, hard hit by this depression, has been one of the many victims of unfair, illegal foreign trade practices. The American potato industry shares the same plight.

In 3 years the volume of foreign potatoes entering the United States has increased by 700 percent. In 1976, Canada exported \$3.3 million worth of potatoes to the United States. By 1981, that figure had risen to \$32.3 million.

The entry of foreign potatoes into the U.S. market has been accelerated because of unfair government subsidization practices by Canada. The U.S. International Trade Commission has determined that Canada has a wide range of programs, including a comprehensive low-interest loan program and a freight-rate assistance program, which clearly aids the Canadian producer's effort to sell potatoes in the United States below the cost of production. Experts believe that the Canadians now have a 3-to-1 advantage over the American potato grower.

At the same time Canadian law prohibits the importation of bulk loads of American potatoes into Canada, and the redtape associated with trying to sell other American potato products in Canada has severely hampered American potato marketing in that country.

The difficulties experienced by potato growers in Maine and other American States are very similar to those that we have endured in the steel industry. Illegal, foreign subsidization has threatened thousands of steel jobs every year.

Clearly the time has come for citizens and their representatives in Congress from all the beleaguered sectors of our economy to join together on behalf of fair trade. In appreciation of the generosity of the Maine potato growers and in recognition of the importance of their case, I have today added my name to a letter that Congresswoman OLYMPIA SNOWE has sent to U.S. Trade Representative William Brock urging prompt negotiations with Canada for an orderly marketing potato agreement.

I hope all Pittsburgh residents will join me in writing to Ambassador Brock, The White House, Washington, D.C. 20500, on behalf of our friends in Maine. We will either all join together to save our steel industry, our potato industry, and all the other targets of unfair illegal foreign trade practices—or we shall surely each fall victim one after the other.●

#### TRIBUTE TO HON. JOHN L. NAPIER

##### HON. BUTLER DERRICK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1982

● Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend and colleague from South Carolina, FLOYD SPENCE, for reserving time today to honor a departing Member of our State delegation, JOHN L. NAPIER.

JOHN NAPIER has represented the Sixth District of South Carolina in the 97th Congress, after winning the seat in 1980 in his first effort as a political candidate. Prior to that he ably served the people of South Carolina as a top aid to Senator STROM THURMOND and as chief minority counsel, first of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee and then of the Senate's Special Committee on Official Conduct.

JOHN was born and raised in Marlboro County, S.C. He is a graduate of Davidson College, with a degree in political science, and he earned a law degree from the University of South Carolina. He is admitted to practice before the Supreme Courts of the United States and South Carolina, and is a member of the American and South Carolina Bar Associations.

JOHN and I sit on different sides of the aisle and we do not always vote the same way, but I value his friendship greatly and can attest to the devotion and vigor with which he has supported the interests of our State and Nation. His work on the Agriculture Committee and Veterans' Affairs Committee showed him to be an unusually able legislator for a freshman.

JOHN, I will personally miss your presence in this Chamber. I would like to wish you and your family the best of luck in what is certain to be a very bright future.●

#### TRIBUTE TO RALPH E. SMITH

##### HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1982

● Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to give recognition today to a man who has both served his country in the U.S. Army and as a dedicated public servant assisting fellow veterans.

Ralph E. Smith, director of the VA Regional Office in Cleveland since 1977, does an excellent job of providing veterans in Cleveland the best service possible.

While representing the 23d Congressional District the past 8 years and serving on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have frequently called upon

Mr. Smith for assistance. He has provided it without fail.

Veterans who go to Ralph's office with a claim or some problem are assured of receiving fair, courteous, and professional treatment.

His fine work has not gone unnoticed. In 1980, he received the Senior Executive Service Performance Award. In 1970, 1971, 1972, and 1977, Mr. Smith won the Superior Performance Award. His effectiveness in implementing cost savings measures won him the Presidential Commendation in 1965.

Mr. Smith joined the Veterans' Administration in 1959 as a claims examiner at the Pittsburgh, Pa., regional office. He has held several positions in data processing management and was named Director of the Systems Development Service for the VA in Washington, D.C., in 1972. From 1973 until 1977, he was project management officer for the development of the VA advanced computer system now in operation throughout the United States. He is a graduate of Duquesne University and the University of Pittsburgh. Mr. Smith is a resident of Broadview Heights. He and his wife, Sylvia, are the parents of three children, Alexander, Robert, and Rebecca.

The 97th Congress and our predecessors have enacted some worthy legislation for our veterans, but the legislation is not worth much if we do not have good people in the field carrying out our policies. For this reason, Directors like Mr. Smith make us all more effective legislators. For this I offer him my deepest gratitude.●

BESS TRUMAN

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1982

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we have set aside a day to pay official tribute to Bess Truman. When I think of Mrs. Truman, I remember the autographed picture her husband, President Truman, gave me. I will keep it always with pride. Bess Truman was like her husband in that they both shared a special strength of character that reflected the times, and endured her to the American people long after leaving the White House. Always she put her husband above all else. She was first and foremost a loving wife, and the President was a fortunate man to have such a woman at his side. The recent passing of Mrs. Truman marks the close of an era for those of us old enough to remember this silent, but dedicated woman behind the man.●

MRS. HARRY S. TRUMAN

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1982

● Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Harry S. Truman was one of the finest and most effective women who ever lived in the White House as a President's wife. She felt that her role was to support and to help her husband and her daughter, Margaret. She did that quietly, with great dignity and effectiveness. She never allowed the welfare or the privacy of her family to be impaired by those whose interest was primarily a story. For that reason she was not as well known as many first ladies.

It was my privilege to know the Trumans, the President, Mrs. Truman, and Margaret, well enough to know the truth that she had great influence on both of them. In my experience her influence seemed always benign. Beyond that she was a loving and delightful person with an abundance of character and charm. Mrs. Truman was at the same time a great lady and a simple person with whom it was a lot of fun to be with.

At crucial times in my life she was of enormous help to me.

I will miss her.●

CLINCH RIVER MEETS ITS  
DEMISE

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment from the hectic pace of these last days before adjournment to urge the Senate to follow the recent action taken by the House and eliminate funding for the Clinch River breeder reactor.

Earlier this week, a bipartisan majority of the House voted to kill the project. As a long-time opponent of this boondoggle, I could not be more pleased.

The Clinch River project makes no sense economically or technologically and holds about as much promise for solving our energy problems as the MX has for reducing the size of the deficit.

If Clinch River was cost effective, there might be reason to support it, but it is not. The initial price tag for the Clinch River breeder reactor read \$422 million. Today, the General Accounting Office has pegged the cost at \$9 billion. That is 20 times the original estimate—20 times more out of the people's pocket.

If the breeder's design was technically up to date, there might be some jus-

tification for it, but it is not. The Clinch River breeder is a technological dinosaur. It is already outmoded by current breeder research and development efforts in the United States and other nations.

If Clinch River was vital to the U.S. energy security, the project might have merit, but it is not. Originally we were told there was an escalating demand for electricity and diminishing supplies of uranium. Both assumptions have proven false. Electrical demand has plummeted and domestic uranium supplies have doubled in the last decade. Private industry has not beaten down the door to invest in the breeder because they know that breeder technology would not be economical until well into the 21st century.

For only one-quarter of the project's cost, we could insulate enough homes to save the equivalent of 48 million barrels of oil for the next 25 years.

If Clinch River was a priority for the American people, I might give it my support, but it is not. The cheering section is empty. Members on both sides of the aisle as well as the National Taxpayers' Union and environmental and church groups agree that Clinch River must go. Even the utilities have given up their front row seats. Their share of the project's cost has shrunk from 50 percent to less than 9 percent.

I have heard a number of my colleagues, many who support Clinch River, stand in this well and point to budget fat to justify slashing health care for the elderly, education for our children and housing for the poor. How do you explain to the people back home that we can afford to spend billions on a project of dubious value, but cannot afford to put them back to work? Is not the average American bearing a heavy enough burden in these trying economic times without having to shoulder this political pork too?

Proponents of Clinch River have tried to sell Congress and the American people a bill of goods. The House did not buy it and I hope the Senate will see fit to join us in killing this boondoggle of a breeder once and for all.●

TRIBUTE TO MR. KENT M.  
WIEDEMANN

HON. GREGORY W. CARMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. CARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give special commendation to Mr. Kent M. Wiedemann, an exceptional member of the American Embassy in Shanghai, China. Mr. Wiedemann recently assisted me during a special factfinding mission on behalf of the



U.S. House of Representatives Banking Committee to promote international trade.

I was very impressed by the organization of the American Embassy in Shanghai. Through Mr. Wiedemann's efforts, my meetings with trade officials in the public and private sectors in China were successful.

Sharing with you a little of Mr. Wiedemann's history is my pleasure. He holds degrees from San Jose State University and the University of Oregon. Mr. Wiedemann has served in the Peace Corps and presently holds the post of deputy principal officer and chief of the economic section in the American Embassy in Shanghai.

Mr. Kent M. Wiedemann's exceptional efforts bring credit to himself, the American Embassy in Shanghai, and to the United States. We are truly fortunate to have him as a member of the U.S. Foreign Service.●

HON. KEN HOLLAND

HON. BUTLER DERRICK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1982

● Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly pleased to have this opportunity to address this body in recognition of my dear friend and colleague who will be leaving this Congress shortly—KEN HOLLAND.

During his tenure in this body KEN has served South Carolina well. He has worked hard to serve the interests of our State and those of his constituents and has likewise served the Nation with distinction. Those of us who have had the privilege of working with KEN personally on various issues agree that he is an independent thinker who remains loyal to his convictions and who keeps his commitments.

As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, he has worked hard to preserve the textile industry, which is so vital to the economic base of South Carolina.

In addition to his great ability as a legislator he has established quite a reputation as a country musician and as an after dinner humorist. I know that he will be successful in whatever he attempts to do in the private sector and am confident that he will continue to live life to the fullest as he returns to South Carolina. Although I am losing a respected colleague, I know the friendship we have developed over these years will remain strong in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. ANDRES D. ONATE

HON. GREGORY W. CARMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. CARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give special commendation to Dr. Andres D. Onate, an exceptional member of the American Embassy in Beijing, China. Dr. Onate recently assisted me during a special factfinding mission on behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives Banking Committee to promote international trade.

I was very impressed by the organization of the American Embassy in Beijing. Through Dr. Onate's efforts my meetings with trade officials in the public and private sectors in China were very successful. Sharing with you a little of Dr. Onate's history is my pleasure. He was born in Arizona in 1940. Dr. Onate holds several degrees from the University of Arizona and has served in the U.S. Air Force. He has written the book, "Mao and the Chinese Communist Party." Dr. Onate presently holds the post of economic officer at the American Embassy in Beijing, China.

Dr. Andres Onate's exceptional efforts bring credit to himself, the American Embassy in Beijing, and to the United States. We are truly fortunate to have him as a member of the U.S. Foreign Service.●

VOLUNTARISM IN GASTON COUNTY, N.C.

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, for years I have encouraged the people of my congressional district to become involved in volunteer activities in their communities. Government does not have the resources to do all that needs to be done, but even if it did, I believe that the concept of voluntarism would still be a much needed one.

Recently I wrote my weekly newsletter on the subject of voluntarism with an emphasis on the involvement of President and Mrs. Reagan in promoting this activity. I have received a letter from my good friend, Barbara Voorhees, the president of the Junior League of Gaston County, N.C., and I would like to share it with my colleagues:

I just finished reading your most recent Washington Report and your excellent comments concerning voluntarism. I felt compelled to write and say that the Junior League is committed to promoting voluntarism in Gaston County.

For almost twenty-five years, League members have given hundreds of thousands

of hours in service to local agencies and on community boards. We initiated such agencies as the Family Counselling Service, Gaston County Speech and Hearing Clinic (now a part of Gaston Memorial Hospital) and the Information and Referral Service.

Our most recent project has been the creation of a voluntary action center—Volunteer Gaston—which was started last spring in coalition with the United Way. Set to "go public" after the first of the year, Volunteer Gaston aims to bridge the gap between agencies needing volunteers (especially service agencies) and individuals of all ages seeking to volunteer.

This fall, we also directed a Foster Family Media Campaign and have begun preparing a slide presentation to increase the number of foster families in the county. This has been done jointly with funds from the First Presbyterian Church and resources from the Department of Social Services with League volunteers doing the leg work.

I cite these two examples to demonstrate that the League is realizing the importance of broad-based community involvement through coalitions as the best hope of solving community problems, in the light of diminishing resources. I am excited about the possibilities facing us in the future, not only in terms of projects, but also in terms of the expertise our members can share as highly trained advocates and volunteers.

Thank you for recognizing the importance of volunteers and voluntarism.●

SISTER OLIVE LOUISE DALLAVIS, C.S.J., LAUDS HON. RICHARD BOLLING

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of participating in a tribute to the Honorable RICHARD BOLLING in Kansas City, Mo., on October 3. Sister Olive Louise Dallavis, C.S.J., president of Avila College in Kansas City, offered the invocation and I want to take this opportunity to share her words with my colleagues:

"The quality of a person's life is in direct proportion to his commitment to excellence regardless of the chosen field."—Vince Lombardi.

And the wind blew and the rain beat  
And the house stood firm  
Being built on the rock of faith.

Richard Bolling is a man about whom this Gospel verse could be written—the weather-beaten public servant who stood his ground. A public servant is a whipping boy. He must stand above interest groups and must muster all his talents to do his political job for the good of the United States first and then its constituencies. Only he as an elected public servant knows his job and its tremendous scope. The areas of government demand representatives with courage, stamina, fortitude to withstand the pressure of myopic forces.

Public thanks are given to our distinguished citizen, Mr. Bolling, who dedicated decades of his life to being that public servant. He loved his work, he was faithful, he did his best.

From Proverbs:

The wise man, Richard Bolling has the sincere desire for instruction;  
His desire for instruction is his love of wisdom;  
And his love of wisdom is the keeping of laws;  
And the keeping of laws is his assurance of immortality;  
And immortality brings him to God.  
So be it.

Bless us, Oh God, and these your gifts which we are about to receive from your Bounty. Amen.●

**NATIONAL SCIENCE CENTER  
FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND  
ELECTRONICS**

**HON. DOUG BARNARD, JR.**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to your attention the Foundation for the National Science Center for Communications and Electronics, a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization created in 1980 by a partnership of industry, science, education, and government. This dynamic group under the leadership of Mr. Robert W. Sarnoff, chairman, and Dr. George M. Snead, Jr., president, is developing plans and raising funds to construct the National Science Center for Communications and Electronics. You will recall that the creation of this center was endorsed by a concurrent resolution passed by this Congress on December 13, 1982.

Those of us in position of responsibility nationally and in Georgia share with the foundation a strong interest in the continuing and critically important role that communications and electronics, science, and technology play in the national security and economic well-being of this country.

The rapidly expanding requirements for highly skilled personnel, particularly in the high technology areas of communications and electronics, are already straining manpower resources. Further, I am advised that the U.S. communications and electronics industry forecasts a need for twice as many technicians and paraprofessionals in the next 5 years, while problems remain in attracting and training qualified personnel. The same forecasts also predict a serious shortfall in engineers during the same period. In addition, the need for trained technical personnel will increase dramatically in the military. The U.S. Army will double its requirements for communications and electronics personnel in the same 5 years, with similar patterns in the other military services.

The importance of trained scientists, engineers, technicians, and other technical personnel to the future of this country becomes even more evident when you consider some basic facts. In terms of economic impact, communica-

tions/electronics is the largest growth industry in the United States. Currently it provides in excess of \$200 billion annually in goods and services. This is forecast to grow to \$400 to \$500 billion annually by 1990. At the same time, communications/electronics industries face the most extensive modernization and technological replacement programs in history as fiber optics, microprocessors, robotics, integrated computer/communications networks, and other products of communications and electronics research and development enter production and expanding use.

The competition for these market opportunities will be aggressive. We must all be aware that our communications and electronics industries have been facing and in the future must be prepared to respond to increasing international competition for their established and created markets in the United States and overseas. Experience should teach us that losses in both domestic and overseas markets are difficult to recover. It is therefore in our national interest to insure that qualified engineers, scientists, and technicians are available in the numbers required by our communications and electronics industry to operate effectively and competitively. We must also be aware of the much greater emphasis being given to science, engineering, and mathematics education in countries of Western Europe and in Japan and the U.S.S.R., and the resulting higher numbers of graduates at all levels.

The National Science Center for Communications and Electronics Foundation has developed a unique response to this challenge, drawing upon the partnership of industry, scientific, military, and academic communities. The foundation proposes to fund the design and construction of the National Science Center for Communications and Electronics and to donate the facility for use onsite and through electronic extension for the introduction to science and technology and the education, training, and retraining of the broadest possible range of Americans, including:

Forty thousand students annually from all military services who attend the U.S. Army Signal School at Fort Gordon, the largest most advanced training center in the world for communications and electronics.

Young people from the elementary to the postgraduate levels in our educational systems.

The general public, with emphasis on understanding the extensive role of communications and electronics in our everyday lives and in our national well-being.

I am pleased that the Augusta-Fort Gordon, Ga., area has been chosen as the site for the Center. This combines the multiple advantages of a location

near the major supporter and user of the Center, close to existing major transportation routes, in an area permitting easy year-round access by multiple means, and in a community dedicated to the support of the Center as a national asset.

I am also confident that the NSCCE Foundation will succeed in its efforts to raise from the private sector of the United States the \$18 million needed to construct the center. I urge all interested individuals and organizations to contact the foundation at its offices in the Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association International Headquarters Building at 5641 Burke Centre Parkway, Burke, Va. 22015; telephone (703) 425-8517.

Recognition is due to the community of Augusta and the central Savannah River area for growing pledges and support, to the New York Council of the U.S. Navy League for its sponsorship of the center as a supported project, and to the following initial corporate supporters: AT&T Co., Bell Laboratories, BDM, Ford Motor Co., Harris Corp., Litton Industries, Magnavox Government and Industrial Electronics Co. (a subsidiary of North American Phillips Corp.), Rockwell International Corp., Southern Bell Telephone Co., United Technologies, and Western Electric.●

**TRIBUTE TO REX LAYTON—CITY  
CLERK OF THE CITY OF LOS  
ANGELES**

**HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, as dean of the Los Angeles city congressional delegation, I would like to pay tribute to a dedicated public servant, Rex Evans Layton, the retiring city clerk of the city of Los Angeles.

Born in Safford, Ariz., in 1920, Rex moved to California where he and his lovely wife Helene have raised their three children, Kristine, Steven, and Robert. Rex is a graduate of the University of Southern California and a registered public accountant in the State of California.

Rex Layton has served Los Angeles as city clerk for the past 14 years. Rex began his employment with the city of Los Angeles in 1946, when he started as a registered public accountant for the city clerk's office. He became city clerk of Los Angeles in 1968 and, since that time, has carried out the numerous responsibilities of this job with honor and distinction.

The city clerk is responsible for the collection of hundreds of millions of dollars in various taxes for the city, and for the administration and ex-



penditure of the budget funds of the city clerk and the city council.

The city clerk is responsible for the appointment, discharge, suspension and transferring of hundreds of employees of the city clerk's office and of the city council, the supervision and conducting of all city municipal elections, and the maintenance of liaison relations with the mayor, city council, city departments, and the public.

The city clerk is also responsible for the city seal, maintenance of an index of all records, maintenance and updating of records for each of the more than 800,000 parcels of real property within the city, direction of the activities of the city's record management program, and the administration of oaths of office to elected and appointed officials.

The presence of the city clerk or a deputy at each meeting of the city council and at each meeting of the 15 standing committees of the city council, and preparation of the minutes of these proceedings is, in itself, an awesome task, and Rex has overseen this function with dedication and thoroughness.

During his term as city clerk, Rex has received two outstanding evaluations from Mayor Sam Yorty and four outstanding evaluations from Mayor Tom Bradley.

Rex Layton is the only general manager for the city that has achieved a fourth step merit rating. He was also recently chosen as "Employee of the Year" for the city of Los Angeles for 1982.

Rex Layton is a member of the International Institute of Municipal Clerks, a world-wide organization of city clerks with a membership of nearly 6,000 persons. Rex served as president of the organization from 1979 to 1980, chairman of its regional reorganization committee in 1980, and chairman of its membership committee from 1972 to 1978.

Rex Layton is also a past office holder in the City Clerks' Association of California; past president of the Southern California City Clerks' Association; past president of the city clerks' department and former board member of the League of California Cities; and is active in the Municipal Finance Officers' Association and the Optimist Club.

Members of Congress, as well as numerous Federal agency officials, know well the name of Rex Layton, for it is under his signature that we have received all official documents from the city over the past 14 years.

It is my pleasure today to extend the gratitude and appreciation of the Los Angeles city congressional delegation to Rex Layton for his many years of service to the city of Los Angeles.●

## A TRIBUTE TO MR. AND MRS. WILLIS BURKHARD CARMAN

### HON. GREGORY W. CARMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. CARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer special recognition to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Willis Burkhard Carman, and the many contributions they have made to Long Island.

Like his father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, my father, Willis Carman, was born in Amityville, Long Island. He is a 10th generation, direct descendant of John Carman, one of the founders of Hemstead, N.Y., in 1643. My father graduated from Fordham Law School and set up a private practice in Farmingdale, N.Y. Willis Carman has been extremely active in the bar association of Nassau County, as well as in many charitable and civic enterprises. He has served as the Farmingdale village justice for many years, and has also served as judge of the Nassau County District Court.

My mother, Marjorie Sosa Carman, attended Skidmore College and married my father in 1927. She has raised a family of three, and, since the death of her father, Gregory Sosa, in 1952, has managed a thriving real estate concern.

As the son of Willis and Marjorie Carman, it is with deep pride and great pleasure that I recognize their valuable contributions to the citizens and communities of Long Island. The Christmas season is a time to remember and reaffirm the strong bonds between parents and their children. I feel extremely fortunate to have witnessed firsthand the contributions my parents have made to the growth and success of our community in Long Island. My brother, Willis Jr., my sister, Joan, and I have been nourished and enriched by their wisdom, devotion, and love. Whatever success I have achieved in my public service career, I owe, in large part, to their firm instruction and sound example.

I wish them continued health and happiness in their life together.●

## THE HUMAN DIMENSION OF THE HOUSE

### HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I wrote a long goodbye speech that presented my views about this institution, its problems, and its future. It sought to articulate what I have learned about the Congress in my 8 years here and it offered some proposals for reform.

But I decided instead to talk briefly about the human dimension of the House. When I came here in 1974, as part of that famous group of "Watergate Babies," I never anticipated that I would grow to love the institution in the way that I do. I never in my wildest dreams thought that I would develop such a respect for the Members here.

I keep thinking what a tragedy it is that the American public cannot see this place from the inside, in the way that those of us who serve here do.

The press and media people pack the gallery upstairs during a debate on a pay raise, but they rarely write or speak about the personal ramifications of the job here. This is not to complain. Every Member here feels that it is a supreme honor to serve as a Member.

But it is important that the public know more about what kinds of people serve here, how hard they work, the personal toll that is taken on individuals and families.

I have seen grown men here cry when their marriages were destroyed. I have seen grown men depressed about missing events that were important to their children.

In sports they have a term called "playing hurt," when players participate even when injured. Well, I have seen Members of the House "play hurt." Members who were ill and dragged themselves to the airport to keep an important commitment back home.

I have seen Members with serious illness or disease struggle to do a good job, to make rollcall votes and committee meetings.

The picture of the Congress presented to the public via the Abscam scandal was not a fair one. This is not a place where you can reach in and pick any seven Members and expect that they will accept money in a brown paper bag. It is not that kind of place and it is an insult to all who have served well here that such a picture of the Congress be presented.

Scandal is what sells newspapers and soap on the evening news. Pay raises and debates over them in this body are in the same category. But these things do not begin to tell the story of what happens here on a day-to-day basis.

What happens here on a day-to-day basis is a struggle to get things done, to do the right thing for our districts, for the Nation and the world. What gets in the way of that is familiar to all of us.

The hectic schedule is a problem. The lack of predictability in the scheduling. The tug and pull of various people and interests wanting our attention. The seemingly constant attention to getting reelected. The accompanying preoccupation with raising money. And, of course, the impact

that such a preoccupation has on policymaking.

There must be a movement developed to deal with these problems. I believe we should move to a 4-year term with a limit of three terms in the House and two 2-year terms in the Senate. I believe we should move to a 2-year budget and plug in a requirement that the Congress do meaningful oversight for 3 or 4 straight months each year.

Most importantly, we need campaign reform—a limit on PAC's, public financing, free access to media, and many other important changes. The political system is being contaminated by money and we must do something about it.

Such dramatic changes must take place with pressure from the outside and I intend to do my share as a private citizen in that regard.

Being a private citizen again will not be altogether unhealthy. Getting out of politics for a time will give me an important perspective.

But there will never be anything to take the place of the warm friendships I have developed here. I have not had the chance to thank each of my colleagues and staff for their kindness. I hope this statement will at least partially serve that purpose.●

#### WHITE-FROEB STUDY DISCREDITED BY SCIENTISTS

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, after 30 years of service to the people of the Second District of North Carolina, I am about to retire from the U.S. House of Representatives. Before leaving I would like to submit, for the RECORD, an item dealing with an issue with which I and many others have long been interested; namely, the alleged effect of smoking on the health of the nonsmoker.

Mr. Speaker, let me briefly place the issue into its proper context. In 1978, the Subcommittee on Tobacco of the House Committee on Agriculture heard testimony from a vast array of eminent scientists and physicians on the issue of the effect of tobacco smoke on nonsmokers. Those individuals who testified generally agreed that no conclusive scientific evidence exists to support the claim that smoking affects the health of nonsmokers. In 1980, however, an article appeared in the *New England Journal of Medicine* by Drs. White and Froeb entitled "Small Airways Dysfunction in Nonsmokers Chronically Exposed to Tobacco Smoke," in which the authors concluded that smoking in the workplace adversely affects the lung func-

tion of nonsmokers. This conclusion appeared to conflict with the testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Tobacco.

Since its publication, the White-Froeb study has been used to support both regulatory and legislative activities in the United States. For example, the study was referred to in testimony before the Civil Aeronautics Board during its recent consideration of rules regarding smoking aboard commercial aircraft. The National Research Council report entitled "Indoor Pollutants" which was issued in 1981 under an EPA contract also relies on the study. Finally, the White-Froeb study has received widespread attention in both State and local legislative and policymaking bodies.

The White-Froeb study continues to play an important role in legislative considerations, despite the fact that the study itself has been heavily criticized by scientists and health practitioners. Most recently, at the 1982 joint meeting of the American Lung Association-American Thoracic Society, Dr. Michael D. Lebowitz, professor of internal medicine, college of medicine, University of Arizona and special consultant to the Subcommittee on Tobacco, presented reasons why, in his own words, "the results of this study cannot be used to demonstrate an effect of passive smoking on forced expiratory flows in adults exposed in the workplace." Dr. Lebowitz, a noted specialist in epidemiology and respiratory diseases, said that the basic problem with the White-Froeb study is that it is "improperly designed" and that "there are problems with the whole data set and with the conclusion." Dr. Lebowitz also expressed concern that the significance of the White-Froeb data appeared to depend upon their unexplained omission of data from 3,000 subjects originally included in the study.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Lebowitz wrote a letter, dated July 10, 1981, to our colleague, Congressman CHARLES ROSE, Chairman of the Tobacco and Peanuts Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, as a result of a personal interview which Chairman ROSE and Dr. Lebowitz had with Dr. White. With the personal consent of Chairman ROSE, I am inserting herewith Dr. Lebowitz's letter. It more fully explains the author's views regarding the White-Froeb study.

I also want to mention another evaluation of the White-Froeb study, one which was made by Dr. J. G. Gostomzyk, director of the department of health of the city of Augsburg, West Germany. After an extensive, detailed review of the White-Froeb study, Dr. Gostomzyk has concluded that the White-Froeb data were incompletely presented and did not satisfy the prerequisites for scientific credibility. In addition, Dr. Gostomzyk remarked

that "Dr. White's methodology is not scientific but that of a lay person with convictions," and concluded that "we assume that Dr. White's study is an attempt at scientific validation of his credo and that he possibly is unaware of the inadequacy of this methodology." It is obvious that Dr. Gostomzyk is referring to Dr. White's outspoken antismoking activities in California, including Dr. White's endorsement of public smoking referendums which were, incidentally, twice rejected by the California voters.

Given these and other criticisms of the White-Froeb study, it would appear that the *New England Journal of Medicine* has, perhaps unwittingly, performed a disservice to its readership. It is extremely unfortunate that a study so fraught with methodological problems, as indicated through numerous criticisms by scientists in the United States and elsewhere, should have been published in such a reputable journal of medicine. The White-Froeb study should, therefore, not be relied upon by the Congress, Federal agencies, or other legislative or policymaking bodies when considering restrictions on smoking in public places.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA,  
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE,  
Tucson, Ariz., July 10, 1981.

Congressman CHARLES ROSE,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Tobacco and  
Peanuts, House of Representatives, Ray-  
burn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROSE: The following is a summary of my notes on our visit to Dr. James White at UC San Diego, as per our discussion. Unfortunately, despite the statement in the editorial of the *New England Journal of Medicine* (27 March 1980), Dr. White and his co-author did not "faultlessly demonstrate a reduction in measures of small airways of healthy non-smokers exposed to cigarette smoke in the work place". It is apparent from our visit and the article that there were various faults in the present study, which shall be discussed.

The problems with the research design are as follows:

The participants were not only volunteers, but generally had to pay for the physical fitness course; this is the reason most were white-collar. Employees in specific factories invited White to run the physical fitness course in their factories as well, which would also bias the population sample. Blue-collar workers were not distributed randomly. (It has to be assumed that volunteers in the physical fitness courses fall into unrepresentative categories: the highly motivated, with an interest in health and usually healthier, those who are worried about health and generally less healthy; the first group would include fewer smokers and the second group would include more smokers.)

The questionnaire utilized was not a validated one per se; test-retest comparisons were made only on the smoking questions and very small groups of subjects. The smoking information was not validated. There were no test-retest or validations on symptoms asked in the questionnaire. The questionnaire itself was derived by the investigator, and included some questions from standard questionnaires; this did not



appear to include standard respiratory questions, and in fact various typical respiratory questions (such as phlegm) were not asked. The questionnaire did not include questions on attitude, but did include questions on activity levels and jobs (duration, type). The questionnaire did ask how many smokers were in their work area, room size, and nature of the air conditioning. It also included questions about residences in the last 20 years (zip codes), so that exposures away from work were assessed by residential location. A question was asked about smokers in the home. [Thus, the smoking information is not validated, but is probably relatively accurate. The information about exposure to passive smoking is only approximate, as is the information on other occupational exposures. Exposures to air pollutants or to unknown toxic gases in the working place is only approximate, and their effects underestimated.]

Dr. White presented a paper to the American College of Sports Medicine, the abstract for which in 1977 indicated there were 7,122 subjects enrolled between 1969 and 1977. However, in the New England Journal of Medicine article, he states that the base population analyzed is only 5,210 smokers and non-smokers enrolled between 1969 and 1979. Although he excluded all the ex-smokers, some whose zip codes were missing, his answers as to why the rest of the subjects were excluded were entirely unclear and tend to indicate potential bias in selection of subjects for consideration for analyses. It might be added that the 2,100 subjects analyzed in the NEJM article and those analyzed and presented in the Sports Medicine abstract appear to be the same as they yield exactly the same table of results (as determined from comparison of the table in the Sports Medicine manuscript and the NEJM table).

In addition to the sources of bias mentioned above, it is apparent that the non-smokers in clean work environments and those in smoking work environments have not only chosen not to smoke, but it is likely that those non-smokers working in smoking environments may be different for a variety of reasons from non-smokers working in clean environments. Furthermore, it is apparent that the non-smokers in non-smoking environments are quite different in that their lung function is "super normal" in comparison even with the Seventh Day Adventists (the source of the Morris prediction equations).

Dr. White did state that from the questionnaire and from the baseline tests that there were no significant differences in the three non-smoking/non-inhaling groups in terms of the amount of previous exercise or oxygen consumption, but he was unsure of the difference in percent of body fat. Smokers did have less body fat, were less in terms of having lower oxygen consumption, and had less activity. He says further that there were no differences between the groups in terms of childhood respiratory history (lower respiratory tract illnesses) from his submitted questionnaire information, but he did not ask about family history. He did not ask sufficiently about respiratory questionnaires to appropriately exclude groups on the basis of productive cough ("cough bronchitis"). He states that there were no differences in prevalence rates of questionnaire responses by zip codes; if so, this contradicts other evidence vis-a-vis the effects of air pollution in these areas. He was not able to assess other exposures such as those from hobbies, exposures to gas stoves, or

transportation. In terms of passive smoking in the home, he excluded such passive smokers from the non-smoking and passive smoking groups, but not from any smoking groups. He was not able to provide any information about the distribution of characteristics in those eliminated from the original 7,000 or the 2,208 that qualified because of other questionnaire results.

With regards to the pulmonary function testing done by Dr. White, it must be first noted that the instrument used is not considered a satisfactory instrument in that it is non-linear (highly biased) at both high volumes and low volumes. [This has the effect of maximizing differences in that anyone with minor aberrations of total vital capacity or of flows at the end of the flow volume curve would have very different, that is, low, flows.] The comparisons that Dr. White did and reported on in his response letter in the NEJM (14 August 1980) would not in any way modify this opinion. Furthermore, Dr. White has the only pulmonary function technician and reader. Even though he was trained at the VA hospital and his techniques were evaluated by test-retest and by comparison to other readers, any biases inherent in Dr. White's thinking (see below) would affect the way he read the tests. Furthermore, he took the FEV<sub>1</sub> and flows off the same spirometer using an approximation technique published by Morris, et al., which is not an adequate or accurate representation of those measures. All of his tests were baseline tests done after two and a half hours in the classroom in the evening on those without acute respiratory illnesses (usually on a Monday or Tuesday evening); thus, there is probably little diurnal variation or pretest biases other than those experienced by the workers during their work day and in their activities prior to the classroom. Although it is difficult to judge the effects of these factors, they may have influenced the test results, especially in those with any significant exposures during the day.

The major problem with the pulmonary function test results as reported is that they are not age- and height-adjusted, since lung volumes and flow rates are associated with both of these factors. In other words, Dr. White used raw values of flows and volumes to do comparisons. He did this on the assumption that the mean age and height were similar for the different groups. This is a mistake, since the distributions for those ages and heights could have differed. Furthermore, his quoted figures for percent predicted are strictly for the average person, age 49, with an average height, and does not represent the group for which they are provided. In terms of these statistical analysis, he just chose the SNK package among many. There is no correlation coefficient per se. "Normality" was not an objective of this study, so he cannot state anything about the normality of the subjects studied, including those he considered to have significantly different results from the non-exposed non-smokers. He does not understand the difference between clinical meaningfulness and statistical significance. It is quite obvious that the majority of those in the passive smoking and in the non-inhaling group are quite normal and that very few would be considered abnormal by any criteria.

In his reported results, he quotes as incorrect significance level of  $p < .005$ , whereas the level provided by the technique is  $p < .05$ . This is very different, given the number of comparisons made, and indicates

that some of the results would not be significant if corrections were made for the number of comparisons. Furthermore, the data presented in Table 1 was used to recompute the SNK analysis by Mary C. Townsend, MPH (Department of Epidemiology, University of Pittsburgh). Those results differ from those published by Dr. White and are provided in the attachment. The most important of the differences is the finding that the passive smokers and light smokers differ for the male FEV<sub>1</sub> 75-85 percent. Thus, the effect of passive smoking on non-smokers is still unconfirmed, despite Dr. White's unfailing conviction that it is confirmed.

Other minor points: In terms of the carbon monoxide sampling, although it is stated that it was randomized, it was really on only 40 smoking and 40 non-smoking situations chosen by chance but not by random selection. Dr. Froeb, the co-author with Dr. White, is a private practitioner in La Jolla and helped Dr. White in drafting the NEJM manuscript from the manuscript presented at the American College of Sport Medicine. It might be pointed out that San Diego is not strictly low in air pollution concentrations, nor uniform throughout the area; this may bias some results. Dr. White performed the pulmonary function tests until "reproducible curves were obtained", but they do not necessarily follow the Intermountain, Snowbird, or ATS recommendations.

In reviewing Dr. White's response to the letter to the Editor in the NEJM (14 August 1980), it is quite clear that Dr. White did not satisfactorily answer all the questions raised, many of which are similar to those raised in this letter. It is questionable, from the discussion, whether Dr. White would pursue any further re-analysis of the data, nor necessarily could it be pursued. It is questionable, given the basic underlying problems in the research design, that re-analysis of the data would be worthwhile. On the other hand, given other results that contradict Dr. White's, including those now in press (such as Comstock et al., Johns Hopkins, presented at the Society for Epidemiological Research in June of 1981), it would be likely that a panel discussion of passive smoking might be valuable. I will be glad to furnish further discussion or help in that matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL D. LEBOWITZ,  
Ph. D., F.C.C.P.,  
Professor of Internal Medicine.●

TOM BUTTERFIELD

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, as 1982 draws to a close, it is customary to reflect upon the events of the past year. I would like to talk about an experience I had just over a year ago and about some sad news I heard just this week.

In December of 1981, a movie called, "The Children Nobody Wanted" was televised. This moving story depicted the work of a man named Tom Butterfield and the help he gave to foster-

lings in Marshall, Mo. On Monday, December 13, my longtime friend, Tom Butterfield died of respiratory failure.

"The Children Nobody Wanted" is a true story. When Tom Butterfield was a freshman at Missouri Valley College in Marshall, Mo., he discovered the problems of children who have nowhere to go, and for whom the law makes few, if any, provisions. Boy by boy, he made a life for these homeless youngsters. Tom fought increasing odds, from the lack of money, to outdated laws. He became the youngest single adult—and the first bachelor—to be a legal foster parent in the State of Missouri. He and his boys rented an old country club and turned it into their ranch. Today, there are four ranches, giving a homelife to over 100 youngsters.

During this special time of the year, it is good to stop and think about the road we are traveling. Looking at the trail of Tom Butterfield's life, I can see that, although he died at the young age of 42, his contributions will go on for a very long time to come. It is appropriate, at this time of gift-giving, to look back at all the giving this man has done in his lifetime. ●

#### ADMINISTRATION'S INSENSITIVE APPROACH TO CANCER

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, the present administration appears to be headed down a regulatory path that will needlessly expose millions of people to many known, cancer-causing chemicals at levels well beyond those traditionally accepted as safe and prudent. One example, documented in hearings held before the Investigations and Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Technology which I chaired, was EPA's failure to take rapid action in setting reasonable limits for exposure to formaldehyde, although it is unquestionably an animal carcinogen. My colleague, Hon. GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr. has done some excellent work in this area and has found similar evidence of EPA's failure to regulate certain pesticides that have been clearly shown to cause tumors in animals. Two recent articles in the New York Times (Dec. 4, 1982) and the Baltimore Sun (Dec. 8, 1982) provide further documentation of the new, high-risk approach to Federal cancer policy. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues. It is time for us to halt this administration's crass and insensitive bottom-line approach in which costs to industry are balanced against increased human suffering. We all owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman

from California and I am looking forward to his forthcoming subcommittee report on this subject.

The articles follow:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Dec. 8, 1982]

#### EPA AND CANCER: THE SHIFTING STANDARDS (By Ken Cook)

WASHINGTON.—In what some critics charge is a fundamental and unjustified change in federal cancer policy, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has determined that an insecticide which caused cancer in laboratory animals poses no cancer risk to human beings.

The decision removes the last barrier to the permanent registration of the insecticide permethrin for use on dozens of U.S. crops.

As a result of emergency exemptions granted by the agency since 1977, permethrin already is one of the country's major insecticides, used on millions of acres of vegetables, beans and cotton each year. Permethrin is marketed under the trade names Pounce and Ambush.

A leading critic of the EPA decision, Representative George E. Brown, Jr., (D., Calif.) characterizes the permethrin ruling as "one of several actions that suggest the EPA has adopted a new set of scientific principles in reaching regulatory decisions on proven animal carcinogens."

Federal pesticide law does not prohibit registration of cancer-causing chemicals if dietary and occupational exposure can be kept below the safety level established by the agency. By contrast, the Food and Drug Administration must by law prohibit the use of any food additive shown to cause cancer in laboratory animals.

The practical effect of a decision to brand permethrin as a human carcinogen would have been a greater restriction on the number of crops for which it could be registered. Such a ruling might also have left the manufacturers, FMC Incorporated of Philadelphia, and ICI, a British firm, more vulnerable to product liability suits.

John W. Melone, director of EPA's hazard evaluation division and author of the permethrin decision (which appeared in the *Federal Register* in October), said that one of the long-term animal studies submitted by a manufacturer in support of the chemical's registration "was clearly positive" for cancer, it reported that tumors had appeared on mice after they had been fed permethrin over an extended period. Mr. Melone said five other studies submitted by manufacturers were accepted by EPA as showing no cancer-causing effects in laboratory animals. However, Mr. Melone described one of those studies as "quite controversial" because EPA scientists could not agree on the results. A seventh study, also conducted by a manufacturer, was rejected because of irregularities in the way it was conducted.

Mr. Melone described the permethrin case as "unique" for having so many long-term studies available for scrutiny by EPA scientists. Only two such studies normally are required for pesticide registration.

"We concluded that the weight of evidence suggested this chemical is highly unlikely to be a potential human oncogen [tumor-inducing substance]," Mr. Melone said in a telephone interview. "And since we have to make a decision, we believe permethrin should not be regulated as a potential human oncogen."

Regarding the permethrin ruling, Mr. Melone said, "There's no question it's a change in perspective."

Representative Brown, chairman of the House Subcommittee on (Agriculture) Department Operations, Research and Foreign Agriculture, which has jurisdiction over EPA's pesticide program, said that "for the agency to adopt a policy which, in effect, attempts to balance positive tests with negative ones is clearly a bold step."

Mr. Brown considers the action "a monumental and quasi-scientific leap of regulatory faith."

There is a continuing debate among cancer experts over how to weigh various types of evidence to determine a chemical's potential to cause cancer in humans. Although the precise mechanisms of cancer remain unknown, scientists have for some time agreed that proven animal carcinogens do not all pose an equal risk of cancer to humans. Traditionally, cancer regulatory decisions, including those made by EPA, have been made as if they did.

In the past few years, several cancer researchers and research institutions have proposed detailed systems by which regulatory agencies might distinguish between "strong" and "weak" carcinogens, based on information gained from long-term animal studies such as those submitted in the permethrin case. Regulatory actions might then take the form of an outright ban if such a system ranked the chemical as a strong cancer risk. Chemicals judged to be weak would be regulated less stringently, or not at all.

Last summer, EPA circulated to a select group of experts a draft of a proposal to modify the agency's original cancer policy guidelines promulgated in 1976. The draft proposed a ranking system similar to one developed by the International Agency for Research on Cancer. According to Dr. Betty Anderson, head of EPA's office of health and environmental assessment, which issued the proposal, the experts who reviewed the document "essentially were not very comfortable with the issues raised. It is unplowed turf."

Dr. Anderson said, "There was an endorsement of the idea of stratifying (ranking) evidence." But the experts did not agree on exactly how to go about it.

However, the agency did apply several ranking schemes in the course of evaluating the carcinogenic potential of permethrin. The outcome of this classification was an important part of the agency's justification for the final decision.

In the past, when faced with ambiguous scientific information on a chemical's cancer-causing potential, EPA scientists generally had assumed that the chemical posed a hazard. A carcinogen ranking scheme, if strictly applied could push the agency's scientific assessments in the opposite direction, making it more likely that chemicals would be approved at the political level, where ultimately all EPA regulatory decisions are made.

Mr. Melone conceded that the agency's cancer policy has not been revised officially to incorporate the ranking approach already used in the permethrin decision. He noted that the 1976 policy "mandated a weight-of-evidence approach but did not lay it out in detail." The permethrin ruling was an example of change in "practice underneath the broad policy," he said.

Some experts familiar with EPA's pesticide policy consider the agency's earlier cancer decisions to have been overly con-



servative, setting an unrealistic precedent the agency cannot now easily change. For example, even though serious environmental problems justified EPA's ban on DDT in 1972, the human cancer threat posed by DDT is now widely thought to have been overstated by the Agency.

Mr. Brown's subcommittee staff is nearing completion of an investigation of EPA's cancer policy for pesticides. As part of the study, the staff contacted "a number of noted cancer researchers" and, according to Mr. Brown, "most of them agree that major regulatory reforms based on these ranking schemes are premature."

"I think the Congress and the public deserve a thorough documentation that this major change is based on adequate science before, not after, the policy is adopted" Mr. Brown said.

Mr. Melone agreed that "ideally the policy would change and then decisions would adhere precisely to it."

"But business goes on and we have to make decisions on chemicals," Mr. Melone stated, "and sometime this drives changes in policy."

The significance of the decision extends beyond its timing. Some scientists inside and outside the agency consider the adoption of a ranking scheme as a legitimate attempt to reform the agency's 1976 cancer guidelines. But others fear a ranking scheme is a means by which EPA Administrator Ann Gorsuch could weaken the agency's regulation of cancer-causing substances.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 4, 1982]

#### ADMINISTRATION DRAFTING NEW POLICY ON REGULATING CANCER-CAUSING AGENTS (By Philip Shabecoff)

WASHINGTON, December 3.—The Reagan Administration is drafting a new, Government-wide policy that would change the way Federal regulatory agencies protect the public from cancer-causing substances.

Administration and industry officials say the new cancer policy is needed to reflect recent advances in science and to provide more flexibility in regulating carcinogens.

But environmentalists and many public health scientists charge that the policy is being designed to ease restrictions on industry and that in practice it would permit a substantially greater amount of cancer-causing substances in the country's air, water, food supplies and working places.

The administration has generally abandoned carrying out the Government cancer policy developed by the Interagency Regulatory Liaison Group in the Carter Administration. One major aspect of that policy required Federal agencies to view cancer-causing substances as a potential risk to human health at any level of exposure.

The Reagan Administration's approach is still being developed, and concrete policy recommendations are not expected to be ready until next spring. But the Interagency Staff Group, which under the President's Office of Science and Technology is preparing the new policy, recently issued a draft "Part I" of its report, a thick document reviewing the state of knowledge about cancer.

#### CRITICS FEAR MAJOR CHANGES

The draft report proposes no specific policies and is somewhat bland in tone. But critics said they saw in it the potential for major departures from established regulatory policy regarding cancer. The critics also said the Environmental Protection Agency, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the Food and Drug Administration

and other Federal agencies had already departed from past practices since this Administration took office in regulatory decisions that reduced the protection of humans from cancer-causing chemicals.

From this report, from other agency documents on cancer policy and from the decisions made by the regulatory agencies over the last two years, the Administration appears to be heading toward these changes in cancer policy, according to environmentalists, public health officials and other concerned parties.

To assume risks to human health at varying "thresholds" of exposure rather than as in the past, assuming that any exposure, no matter how low, conveys a measurable risk of cancer.

To differentiate between cancer-causing substances that change the genetic properties of the cell and those that act by other means, and then to alter regulatory approaches accordingly. Under the former policy, all carcinogens were treated the same.

To rely less on laboratory tests on animals and to wait instead for epidemiological studies of sickness and death in human populations in deciding on the dangers of chemicals and other carcinogens and how to regulate them.

To raise the level of risk considered significant for human exposure to cancer-causing substances and to regulate them accordingly.

To place more emphasis on voluntary "life style" causes of cancer, such as smoking, and less on environmental causes, such as chemicals in the air, water, food and workplace.

To give increased weight to the costs as well as benefits of regulatory decisions on protecting people from cancer.

#### SUPPLY-SIDE CARCINOGENESIS

Myra L. Karstadt, director of the Environmental Cancer Information Center at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York said the Reagan Administration effort was being described in toxicology circles as "supply-side carcinogenesis."

But Administration officials interviewed recently insisted first that no new policy had yet been established and, second, that whatever policy did emerge would be based on the weight of scientific evidence, not on political considerations.

Denis Prager, chairman of Interagency Staff Group, said the cancer policy promulgated under the Carter Administration was "a little too definite in areas where there are still uncertainties and often stated principles as immutable facts."

Dr. Prager, who is assistant director of the Office of Science and Technology, said new information on the mechanisms of carcinogenesis was emerging almost daily. He said the new policy now being prepared "hopefully will add to the scientific credibility" of regulatory activities.

#### FULL DISCUSSION PROMISED

He also said that the process of developing the policy "will be as open as possible" and that whatever emerges would not be regarded as the final word on the subject but part of a continuing process.

Dr. Prager also noted, however, that the revision of cancer policy was being conducted "under the aegis" of Vice President Bush's office, which has been given responsibility for President Reagan's regulatory changes.

"There is no way we can separate this exercise from other Administration pro-

grams," he said. But he added: "Neither the President nor the Vice President has said to come up with a cancer policy more liberal than the current one. We are not politically constrained."

Some Administration officials do not see the need for revising Federal cancer policy. J. Donald Millar, Director of the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, which does research and makes recommendations on workplace hazards, said in a recent interview: "We felt the prior carcinogen policy was useful. We don't see any reason to change it."

Dr. Millar said he believed the policy was being revised because "the chemical industry finds it to be an onerous responsibility." He also said he had not been consulted about plans to change policy, although his agency deals with carcinogens in the workplace.

#### CHEMICAL INDUSTRY WANTS CHANGES

The chemical industry has, in fact, been pressing hard for new approaches to regulating carcinogens. Gordon Strickland, deputy director of the Chemical Manufacturers Association, a leading industry group, said, "Cancer policy is outdated and should be changed to reflect today's science."

He said public fears of the danger of cancer from chemicals in the environment were exaggerated and "would simply dissipate if we have good science." He said that cancer rates were stable and that the "common perception that cancer mortality related to the production of chemicals is mistaken."

"The old cancer policy had been founded on the notion of zero exposure to cancer," Mr. Strickland said. But with increasing sophistication in measuring, he said, it is now possible to find chemicals in parts per trillion where measurements used to be in parts per million and the definition of zero exposure keeps changing. Because of this "vanishing zero," he considered, "the concept of zero exposure is not realistic anymore."

While regulating cancer-causing substances is difficult because of moral as well as scientific issues, "we have to look at the costs and benefits and balance them," he said. He added that all carcinogens should not be regarded as posing the same level of risk.

#### SOME SEE NO NEED FOR CHANGES

But several scientists and public health officials said the developments of scientific data does not justify changes in the cancer policy. Dr. Arthur C. Upton of the New York University Medical Center, who was director of the National Cancer Institute from 1977 through 1980, said he did not personally see a need to change "a cancer regulatory policy that has evolved for 20 years and was the basis of the Carter Administration's regulatory policy."

The accepted public health approach holds that "it is unproved but reasonable" to assume that there is no threshold below which a carcinogen poses no risk to health, Dr. Upton said. He added that he could understand that "it is difficult for many people to accept this concept, especially when it results in a heavy economic impact."

Dr. Upton said he had not followed the regulatory practices of the Reagan Administration closely and was reluctant to be "harsh" about it.

"But I must confess I have been troubled by indications of efforts to relax vigilance and set aside evidence," he said adding,

"There is seemingly less readiness to classify substances and to take regulatory precautions that prudence would dictate."

Much of the criticism of the Administration's evolving cancer policy has focused on the Environmental Protection Agency. An agency decision not to regulate formaldehyde as a carcinogen, even though formaldehyde has caused nasal cancer in laboratory mice, provoked sharp attacks. John Todhunter, the agency's assistant administrator for toxic substances, said that while the animals had shown susceptibility to the widely used chemical, there was no evidence that it posed a significant risk to humans at low levels of exposure.

#### PROPOSAL ON DIOXINS ASSAILED

Recently the agency was assailed for weighing a policy option that would consider a higher level than what was previously accepted for human exposure to dioxins, an extremely toxic substance, at several places in Missouri.

Something of an uproar among environmentalists and public health scientists was created by a recent memorandum by Dr. Roy Albert of the New York University Medical Center, who is chairman of the environmental agency's carcinogen assessment group, suggesting that a distinction might be made between genotoxic substances that cause cell mutations and other carcinogens that do not have that impact. Dr. Albert suggested the possibility of treating the genotoxic substances as if there was no safe threshold but using a conventional toxicologic approach to the nonmutagenic substances by limiting exposure to a "no observable effect level."

Dr. Albert said the response he has gotten indicated that the scientific community is split evenly on the value of this approach. But he said there was wide support for the concept of stratifying the degree of risks of various cancer-causing agents as a first step toward "attuning a regulatory approach to the weight of evidence."

Frederica P. Perara, senior staff scientist for the Environmental Protection Agency, opposed Dr. Albert's approach on the ground that "knowledge of the mechanisms involved in cancer is still very limited." The proposed policy change, she said, could result in a "significant lessening of health protection against carcinogens."

John P. Hernandez, assistant administrator of the E.P.A., said the general cancer policy left by the Carter Administration "froze us into place," instead of giving the flexibility necessary to deal with the wide range of laws the agency administers.

#### 'RADICAL CHANGES' FEARED

But Ellen K. Silbergeld, chief toxicologist for the Environmental Defense Fund, charged that the Administration and the agency were seeking to change the overall policy "in order to support radical changes in regulation." She said the agency would soon have to make regulatory decisions affecting hazardous air pollutants and volatile organic compounds in drinking water and was seeking to establish an "intellectual framework" in which it could increase the acceptable levels of cancer-causing agents in the air and water.

Dr. Silbergeld asserted that an effort is being made to prepare the public for "the revolutionary revisionism of carcinogen policy which is in progress in this Administration and the E.P.A."

Marvin Schneiderman, former associate director for science policy and for field studies and statistics of the National Cancer In-

stitute, said the Reagan Administration "is trying to demonstrate something they really believe—that there are far fewer things in the world that are hazardous and need to be controlled."

"But if you are health oriented," said Dr. Schneiderman, now a teacher and consultant, "you want to find things that cause cancer and regulate them." ●

#### SUPPORT FOR DOMESTIC CONTENT BILL

HON. NORMAN E. D'AMOURS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. D'AMOURS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the floor of the House yesterday evening and thus missed the votes on the Fenwick amendment to the Domestic Content bill and on final passage of H.R. 5133. I regret that the Fenwick amendment was adopted because I believe it guts the major provisions of the bill. Had I been present I would have voted against the Fenwick amendment. I also would have voted for final passage of the Domestic Content bill. I am delighted that the House passed this legislation by a vote of 215 to 188 as I believe it will send a strong message to our trading partners, and to the American people, that the Congress is serious about protecting American jobs from unfair foreign competition.

#### THE GAS TAX IS NOT A JOBS BILL

HON. ED BETHUNE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. BETHUNE. Mr. Speaker, I recommend the following article from the Washington Post to my colleagues who may still be wondering about the gas tax.

#### STOP THE "QUICK NICKEL" GAS TAX

(By Richard A. Snelling)

No matter what combination of the three "quick nickel" highway bills now before Congress is ultimately passed as a result of the current steamroller in Washington, the bill will not do the things its backers have promised. Specifically, the quick nickel will not do anything about the current severe unemployment problem (except possibly make it worse) and it will not fill potholes.

The White House (correctly) denies that this is a jobs bill. Nevertheless, the Department of Transportation tells anybody who will listen that precisely 170,000 jobs will be created. The only reason the bill is being considered at all in the lame-duck session is the great need of Congress to appear to do something about the unemployment situation.

The bill is not going to create jobs. In its early years, it takes more money out of the economy than it puts back in. Neither a Keynesian nor a supply-side economist

would claim that sending more money to Washington is a way to create jobs.

If we don't have to send that \$5.5 billion a year to Washington, we will presumably spend it to buy something else. If we do send that money to Washington, we won't be able to use it to buy something else. Whoever makes that "something else" will lose his or her job. Eventually, some of the money will result in creating some new construction jobs while eliminating jobs elsewhere in the economy.

Since the money leaves our pockets well before it ever comes back from Washington, the short-term effect will be a loss of jobs and not a gain. To make things even worse as far as jobs are concerned, it is unlikely that all states will be able to spend all the money that will theoretically be available to them. This federal money must be matched by state money. Since many states are already having difficulty matching the federal funds they are now eligible for, it is unlikely that these states will be able to match any more federal funds—especially since the federal government is planning to preempt their ability to raise state gas taxes.

The bill is touted as a way to fill the nation's potholes. There are certainly plenty of potholes that need filling. However, this bill simply extends existing federal highway programs, and federal highway money is not available for filling potholes under these programs unless the whole road is repaved. As a matter of fact, the road also has to be "wide enough" and "straight enough" to meet federal standards in order to qualify for this repaving money.

There are roads that do need to be completely reconstructed. There are also other roads that simply need to have their potholes filled and their cracks sealed. It is because of a lack of pothole-filling and crack-sealing over the last decade that so many roads need to be completely repaved or reconstructed now. This bill continues the tradition of encouraging massive reconstruction rather than simple preventive maintenance.

Many states, including Vermont, already need to raise their own gas taxes this year to meet unmet maintenance requirements. It is unlikely that those states will want to impose any further "user charges" on top of a large federal increase. When states raise their own gasoline tax, they can use the money from that increase to meet their most urgent priorities—whether those priorities be pothole-filling or new construction. It has been known for a long time that state-only projects are cheaper and can be done more quickly than projects using federal money.

It is easy to understand why those who have been frustrated by Congress' inability to pass a multi-year highway bill are jumping aboard the quick-nickel steamroller. They are afraid that, if Congress does not pass this bill now, it will never address highway needs constructively. They are willing to accept any bill, even a bad bill, as long as there is some more money for highways.

Nevertheless, a bad five-year bill passed during the lame-duck session will be worse for the nation than no bill at all. It will neither create jobs nor fill potholes. It will frustrate the ability of the states to achieve these goals themselves.

Although many states will be winners from the quick nickel, others will be substantial losers. The Reagan administration dedicated itself to a restructured federalism, which recognized the diversity of needs and problems in the different states. It is ironic



that this administration is pushing a bill that extends federal decision-making even further and cripples the ability of states to meet their individual highest priority needs.

This lame-duck Congress ought to go home. After the Christmas recess, a new Congress should come back and address the nation's transportation (and other) problems in a constructive way. The quick nickel ought to be allowed to die a quick death.

(The writer, governor of Vermont was president of the National Governors Association during 1981-1982.)

#### BOWIE HIGH SCHOOL SOCCER TEAM

#### HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding achievement of the Bowie High School soccer team and its coach, Lou Reck.

Working with a young team short on experience but long on heart and enthusiasm, Mr. Reck led the Bowie Bulldogs to an undefeated 15-0 season, setting the stage for the Maryland Class AA State soccer championship battle. In the finals of the State championship, Bowie was victorious with a 2-1 victory over Severna Park in a hard-fought, double-overtime battle.

As a junior varsity coach, Lou Reck led his Bowie team to an astonishing 30-0 record and three Prince Georges County titles. Bowie qualified for the State playoffs during Lou's first 2 years as head coach, yet the State title always alluded him.

This year, Mr. Speaker, was quite a different story. Under the excellent goaltending of Terri Curran, the fighting Bulldogs allowed only one goal to be scored against them the entire season and only then in the double-overtime final.

The Bowie High School soccer team members and its coach deserve our special attention and congratulations. Each athlete performed magnificently and each made that all-important extra effort to insure victory. Mr. Speaker, I know that the Members of the body join me in saluting the championship athletes of Bowie High School and its outstanding coach, Mr. Lou Reck, on an accomplishment well deserved.

#### THESE ARE OUR SONS WHO ARE DYING

#### HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, today, in my State of California, another aging U.S. Air Force B-52

crashed killing the entire crew of nine young officers and airmen. How many more dedicated, fine young public servants in the flight uniforms of our military services have to die to stop the yearly attacks on the B-1 in this Congress and the attempts to terminate this SAC bomber replacement program?

Please stop this ignorant demagoguery. It is killing our pilots and their crews to extend the life of our oldest B-52's beyond its designer's wildest estimates and hopes.

I submit for the RECORD an excellent speech by Mr. S. F. Iacobellis last May defending our B-1. Mr. Iacobellis is the B-1B program manager, North American Aircraft and Operations, Rockwell International.

The speech follows:

It is an honor and a pleasure to be here to speak about the production of the U.S. Air Force B-1B long range combat aircraft.

I understand you've been having these Wednesday gatherings for 57 years without a miss. Obviously you have a proud heritage and a fine tradition at the Los Angeles Breakfast Club.

It's just the same with Rockwell. We've been in the aerospace business for nearly 55 years. From that activity has come our own proud heritage and fine tradition in building aircraft.

I've learned something very important in my time with North American Aviation Incorporated, now Rockwell International. Companies don't build aircraft.

People build aircraft.

People built the North American B-25 Mitchell. In 1942 sixteen Mitchells flew from the deck of the USS Hornet to strike Tokyo under the command of Lieutenant Colonel Jimmy Doolittle.

People built the North American P-51 Mustang. Assigned to the Eighth Air Force it helped the Allies ruin the reputation of the Luftwaffe in raid after raid over Germany.

People built the North American F-86 Sabre Jet. During the Korean War it gave the United States air superiority over the Russian MIG-15 by a 10 to 1 kill ratio.

People built the North American F-100 Super Sabre. On its very first test flight it established a world speed record on the way to becoming the United States first operational supersonic fighter.

People built the North American X-15 rocket research aircraft. With such pilots at the controls as Astronaut Neil Armstrong, the X-15 set world altitude and speed records for winged aircraft in its flights at Edwards Air Force Base.

I'm sure you're aware that our people at Rockwell International are building the space shuttle. And before that, they played a major role in building the Apollo vehicles and propulsion systems for the successful lunar landings and returns.

Today, people of my company are building the B-1B.

They are building it because the Department of Defense has determined that a critical strategic imbalance exists between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The B-52 is the air breathing mainstay of the Strategic Air Command. But some models of the B-52 are a quarter-of-a-century old. Many of the pilots who fly them are younger than the aircraft itself. Counting the FB-111, as well as the B-52, the Strategic

Air Command has about 412 serviceable strategic aircraft. That number compares to the Soviet Union's more than 800 strategic aircraft. They include the Backfire bomber, which has been rolling off the line month after month for several years.

And that doesn't take into account the fact that the strategic U.S.-U.S.S.R. balance also is tipped heavily in favor of the Soviets with respect to submarine launched ballistic missiles and intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The B-1B is ideally suited to help redress that imbalance. It is a new aircraft.

Using advanced technology now available, the B-1B is an outstanding improvement over the B-1A prototypes, which the people at Rockwell also built. The B-1A was not delivered to the Strategic Air Command because production was cancelled by President Carter.

The B-1B is designed to be a multi-role aircraft, able to perform conventional, nuclear and cruise missile missions. By contrast, the B-1A's primary mission capability was as a low-altitude penetrator to deliver nuclear weapons. The B-1B's range has been significantly upgraded. It will be able to fly intercontinental missions without need of refueling. And the Air Force is extremely confident about the B-1B's prospects for survival against probing radar and other threats.

In a hearing before the U.S. Senate's Subcommittee on Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces, Air Force Chief of Staff General Lew Allen said, and I quote:

"Even though we expect the Soviets to make major improvements in their air defense capabilities the B-1B, flying at low altitude and with dramatically reduced radar profile and advanced electronic countermeasures, will be able to penetrate and strike targets throughout the Soviet Union well into the 1990's. And this could be extended by further progress in electronic jamming."

As I said a few moments ago, the B-1B is a new aircraft, but it enjoys the best of two worlds.

It incorporates the proven capabilities of the B-1A prototypes, which compiled an outstanding record at Edwards Air Force Base during almost 2,000 hours of flight test. The B-1B also incorporates many improvements to further extend its capability.

I have already mentioned multi-role ability and range. There are other significant improvements:

As General Allen implied in his Congressional statement, we have made very significant progress in assuring that the airplane will be extremely hard to detect. For example: The B-1A radar image was ten times smaller than that of the B-52. The B-1B radar image is already ten times smaller than the B-1A. That's a 100 to 1 image reduction over the B-52.

Another important improvement is payload carrying capability. The airplane's maximum gross takeoff weight has been increased from 395,000 pounds to 477,000 pounds. This allows more fuel and/or weapons to be transported.

Payload flexibility is another key item. The two weapons bays in the forward portion of the aircraft will have a movable blukhead which can be moved in the field. This means that many different size weapons—like cruise missiles—can be accommodated. Fuel tanks can also be carried internally to extend range. At the same time, weapons and fuel could be carried external-

ly on the under-side of the fuselage for even greater mission capability.

The list of B-1B improvements is much longer. It includes items like vastly improved electronics and greater aerodynamic efficiencies. The point is simply this: The B-1B is designed to be the most capable strategic aircraft in the world.

The B-1B will be a tremendous deterrent to any act of aggression by any adversary today or anyone who may become an adversary in the next 30 years. They will think twice before they enter into an act of aggression against this nation because of the existence of the B-1B. Russian strategists know that the B-1B carrying nuclear weapons will be able to take off from the U.S. mainland and penetrate the Soviet Union at an altitude of only 200 feet to evade radar detection. It would then be able to fly to a recovery base completing the entire mission without need of refueling.

Or it can carry cruise missiles for a Soviet strike and return to the continental U.S. without need of refueling.

Let me be even more graphic to illustrate the B-1B's mission capability and flexibility. A few minutes ago I mentioned the B-25 raid on the Japanese mainland in the early days of World War II.

Just think of the immensity of that undertaking. Besides the months of planning and training it required the following minimums:

An aircraft carrier, the USS *Hornet*, with all its crew and support equipment.

A complement of support ships, with all their crews and equipment, to protect the carrier.

Sixteen B-25s, carrying a combined weapons load of 64 500-pounders.

Eighty airmen, led by Colonel Doolittle.

The airplanes left the deck of the *Hornet* when they were about 800 nautical miles from Tokyo. After conducting the raid they were supposed to recover as best they might on the Chinese mainland. We all remember what a hit and miss proposition that turned out to be. There was the loss of life and many of the airplanes ran out of fuel. Doolittle, himself, bailed out over China and was lucky to survive.

Now what could a single B-1B have done on the same raid?

Well, right off the bat, one B-1B could have carried more 500-pounders than the entire complement of 64 which the Doolittle Raiders had on board their 16 B-25's.

Then, too, there's the tremendous range of the B-1B. Carrying more payload than all the Doolittle Raiders combined. The B-1B could have left the continental United States just before dawn and flown all the way to Tokyo. After completing its mission, the B-1B could have flown all the way back to its U.S. base in Alaska and been there in time for the dinner hour at the club.

All this nonstop, without need for refueling—in fact with plenty of fuel to spare.

All this with survivability enhanced because of high speed and on board countermeasures.

All this with only one airplane instead of 16, and four airmen instead of 80.

All this without the stupendous expense of an aircraft carrier and support ships and all their crews and equipment.

Looking at all that, I think you could say the B-1B has capability.

The B-1B production program calls for 100 aircraft to be produced at the cost of \$20.5 billion, expressed in 1981 dollars.

The North American Aircraft Operations of Rockwell is the over-all systems contrac-

tor on the program. General Electric is responsible for the engines. Boeing is producing the offensive avionics for the aircraft, and AIL, a division of EATON, is producing the defensive avionics.

The production schedule is ambitious, but we are determined to beat it. The contract calls for the first B-1B to be delivered to the Air Force and enter flight test in March 1985. That's 38 months after contract go-ahead. Any veteran aircraft builder will tell you that's a very short time, indeed when it comes to a very advanced aircraft like the B-1B. But we're even ahead of that time line. We're nearly three months ahead of schedule and intend to remain so.

The first fifteen B-1B's will be delivered in 1986 and the 100th aircraft will be completed in early 1988.

As I indicated, since going on contract with the Air Force on January 20 for the B-1B full scale development and production go-ahead, we have made outstanding progress on the program at Rockwell.

All our major subcontractors throughout the United States have been turned on full bore. They will build approximately 55 percent of our portion of the aircraft so B-1B production is national in scope.

Our facilities expansion program is in full swing at Rockwell. We occupied a new 341,000 square foot engineering building in January. In March we began construction of an \$83 million, 950,000 square foot final assembly complex at Palmdale, California. In all we will have more than seven million square feet of space for the program at Rockwell.

We are on plan with other capital investments. The first deliveries have been made of major milling machine components for the heavy machining centers at our El Segundo, California and Columbus, Ohio plants. The order has a approximate value of \$40 million. In addition, more than \$20 million in key high technology equipment is in place or on order. Rockwell's total capital investment in the B-1B program will be more than \$400 million.

Our manpower build up is going forward as planned at El Segundo, Columbus, Ohio, Palmdale and Tulsa, Oklahoma. We anticipate no significant manpower problems. Our buildup requires no steep climbs since we started with a proven cadre of veteran B-1B employees. At the peak of production in 1986/87, more than 20,000 Rockwell employees will be working directly on the B-1B employment will be approximately 55,000. That will involve more than 3,000 subcontractors and suppliers in addition to Rockwell, Boeing, AIL and General Electric.

On many other fronts we are on or ahead of schedule. More than 2½ shipsets of stored B-1 assets are being speedily put back into work. The first B-1B parts have been fabricated. In fact, the production go-ahead occurred on January 20, and only nine days later the first part for the B-1B was made. To date we have over 1,500 new parts fabricated. More than two-thirds of the needed structural engineering drawings have been released to manufacturing. We have over 30,000 tool orders and manufacturing directives issued to the shop so we're well on our way. The program is going extremely well. I believe that we are going to meet or beat all of the delivery schedules that I mentioned.

That, in a nutshell, is the status of the B-1B program.

But, let me emphasize, again, people build aircraft, not companies.

So it is with the B-1B.

It will be an airplane which fits right into the tradition of the great airplanes produced at Rockwell, built by very dedicated people. The T-6, the P-51, the B-25, F-86, F-100 and X-15, now the B-1. Thoroughbreds all.

Thank you.●

## A TRIBUTE TO KANSAS UNIVERSITY

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, for 16 years, I had the opportunity of representing the University of Kansas in Lawrence. Because of redistricting, Lawrence and Douglas Counties are no longer in the Third District. My association with the university will not be as direct, but I will still be very close to KU, my alma mater.

I will miss representing the University of Kansas—its fine faculty and students, the physical beauty of the campus on Mount Oread, and the excellent curriculum the university possesses. I will miss dealing with the need and problems of a major university like KU even though I will remain an active member of the alumni association, which is one of the best in the land.

I graduated from KU in 1941 and I have always been thankful for the educational opportunity it provided me. In addition to the academic credentials I was able to secure, KU gave me a strong sense of loyalty to the university in particular and the State of Kansas as a whole. I will never forget walking down the hill on graduation day and feeling the deep pride associated with graduating from college—especially a school like KU. Of course, you might say I am partial and prejudiced, but let me point out that recently, my alma mater received national recognition from a variety of publications for its academic standards and I thought it would be appropriate, at this time, to pay tribute to a great university.

Washingtonian magazine, in its December issue, included Kansas among a group of universities that provide a top-flight education at a reasonable cost. In these days of rising tuition and fees, KU remains very affordable to the thousands of undergraduate and graduate students who matriculate there every year.

"Kansas is a comprehensive, doctoral granting institution that, in selective areas, has some of the finest programs in the country," writes Edward B. Fiske, author of the "New York Times Selective Guide to Colleges." Fiske describes the campus as "beautiful, sitting atop Mount Oread." The Changing Times is another publica-



tion which rates KU as a desirable university at a reasonable cost.

Another aspect of KU that makes me especially proud are the caliber of its graduates. Many KU alumni have moved on to successful careers in all walks of life and all of them remember vividly the impact that KU had on their lives. I remember the second Space Shuttle launch when astronaut Joe Engle, a KU graduate, took the university flag with him while in orbit. Later, he proudly presented the flag to KU in a ceremony at the halftime of a football game. Joe presented the flag with pride and appreciation to Chancellor Gene Budig epitomizing the spirit of Jayhawk graduates.

I bid the main campus at KU an official goodbye, but Mount Oread will always be a special place to me and I intend to remain a loyal alum and a good friend of the University of Kansas.

I continue to be proud representing the University of Kansas Medical School in Kansas City, Kans.●

# "FROM CUBA WITH HATE"

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, never has an article been more aptly entitled than Peter Michelmores's "From Cuba With Hate," in the current Reader's Digest. I am submitting this article to inform the Members of Congress of the darker implications of one ugly aspect of this Nation's unprecedented crime wave.

FROM CUBA WITH HATE

(By Peter Michelmores)

Claribel Benitez was a pretty 19-year-old who worked as a receptionist in a legal office. She lived with her parents in an apartment on NW 37th Avenue, in a middle-class section of Miami. Early one evening she agreed to drive her brother Leo to a used-car lot to inspect an automobile. In the manner of well-brought-up Cuban-American girls, she left a note for her parents explaining her absence.

On the way back home, Claribel detoured into the neighborhood shopping plaza. Leo wanted to be dropped off at a supermarket to see his girlfriend. It was a little past 9:30 p.m., March 12, 1981. Stores around the perimeter of the brightly lit plaza were emptying of late shoppers.

Claribel kept the motor running while Leo hopped out and hurried into the market. As Claribel began slowly driving away, the car door beside her was wrenched open. She looked into the face of a dark-haired stranger with a gun in his hand. As the gunman pushed Claribel across the seat to make room for himself behind the wheel, a swarthy accomplice scrambled through the back door. The gunman screamed a curse, and began shouting at the second man in Spanish. The accomplice had been ordered to invade the front seat, not the back to trap the girl between them.

While the argument raged, Claribel reached about the floor for a knife concealed there. Her fingers gripped the handle. Gamely, she struck at the gunman. The blade grazed his left hand and his side.

Startled, the man in the back seat raised a can of Mace and filled the car with the stinging chemical spray. Bellowing in fury, the gunman in front thrust his pistol at Claribel's chest and fired.

Blood gushed from her wound as the two men leaped from the car. One was carrying Claribel's purse. The girl herself struggled to stay conscious. Propping herself behind the driving wheel, she had the car moving even as she saw her attackers join a third man in a station wagon. She weaved through the plaza for 80 yards, and then lurched across the main avenue to the parking lot of a roadside restaurant. She had friends there. Somehow she held on long enough to get out of the car and stagger inside, only to collapse on the floor.

Horrified waitresses rushed to her side. "Claribel! What happened?"

She was slipping into delirium, fighting for coherence. A police officer, arriving just ahead of the ambulance, knelt to smooth her dark-brown hair. She looked up at him. "Marielitos," she whispered. "Three Marielitos. . . ."

At 12 minutes past midnight Claribel died in surgery at Jackson Memorial Hospital. She had repeated Marielitos many times. To those who heard her, the word needed no explanation.

They had come in the thousands during the spring and summer of 1980 with the great refugee tide from Cuba's Mariel Harbor, gaunt men with stone-hard eyes and crude tattoos on their bodies. Many had been released from prisons and put on the boats, but they carried no records of their past. They were just men from Mariel—Marielitos. The name set them apart from the host of true refugees.

Almost from the beginning there had been an uncommon menace about these men. In recent months it had become a reality. They had plunged into crime with a savagery and recklessness that bordered on lunacy. Other Cuban-Americans were ashamed of them and called them *escoria* (scum).

The American government, during the Administration of Jimmy Carter, had been duped by Cuba's Communist dictator, Fidel Castro. Under cover of the Mariel boat lift, Castro set among an open society a vicious new criminal force. The scope and predictable effect of his infamous deed should have been detected early, but it was not. To this day, Castro's outlaw invasion has not been recognized, or confronted nationally.

"I'M THE BADDEST"

Through the 1960s and '70s, vast numbers of Cuba's most skilled and productive citizens had fled to the United States. In later years, people from the working classes joined their ranks. The revolution, supposedly the workers' revolution, could no longer even provide adequate food for their tables.

Demonstration of the discontent in Cuba was given on Easter weekend in 1980. Twenty-five Cuban men, women and children were inside Havana's Peruvian embassy at the time, claiming asylum. Radio Havana described them as lumpen, an expression meaning contemptible.

In a typically theatrical act, Castro had the police guards removed from outside the embassy on Good Friday. Cuba could well do without hungry lumpen mouths, he said.

Let Peru feed them. But he badly miscalculated the numbers of his disenfranchised. By Easter Sunday, when the guards returned in force, more than 10,000 citizens had jammed into the embassy grounds. They included carpenters, mechanics, physicians, housewives, students.

Several countries, the United States included, offered to take a share of the fugitives. But plans for orderly transport were sabotaged when Cuba released 37 of the embassy crowd to a man who sailed free-lance from Key West to Cuba. Within a week, the waters between Florida and Mariel Harbor, about 30 miles west of Havana, were alive with boats. They ferried refugees pouring out from the embassy, the cities, the towns, the farms. Florida began taking them in at the rate of 3,000 and 4,000 a day.

To save face and turn the confusion to advantage, Castro decreed: "If they want *excoria*, let's give them *escoria*."

Throughout the island, from Pinar del Rio to Oriente Province, local Committees for the Defense of the Revolution were instructed to flush out "undesirables." Under threat of punishment if they refused, ex-convicts, homosexuals, suspected black-marketeters, vagrants and troublemakers were offered one-way passage to the United States. A huge, heavily guarded camp was established at El Mosquito plantation, near Mariel, as a departure base for the outcasts. They were taken directly from there to the docks and escorted aboard boats bound for Florida.

With no sign in Washington that the illegal boat lift would be blockaded, Castro extended his roundup to the prisons, insane asylums and juvenile-delinquent farms. Legitimate refugees were upset by what they saw as an attempt to stigmatize them. But they also reasoned that many of those released from prison would be political prisoners; others, men and women who had been jailed for such crimes as stealing shoes; still others, innocent victims of a justice system in which innocence was never presumed.

The fact was, however, that Cuba did have a substantial population of hardened felons. And, much more ominous, they had been incarcerated under such prolonged torment that many were mentally twisted or broken. Humanity was not forgotten in the prisons; it was lost. Men were objects for abuse. Sadism was rampant. Guards beat inmates with clubs and machetes. The toughest inmates preyed mercilessly on the weakest. Common criminals, a large proportion of them poor, ill-educated Afro-Cubans, were very often remade into psychopaths.

Typical of their experience was that of a man called Harpo. At age 36 he was a terminal convict, no trace left of the lad of 16 who was first jailed as a petty thief. His life was reduced to day-by-day survival, his world to a dark proving ground of his machismo. A man was measured by his capacity for violence. The meaner he was perceived to be, the more he was protected against being beaten, raped, robbed or killed by his fellows. Fights were unceasing in the open galleries of San Severino Castillo prison in Matanzas Province where Harpo was held. Victors wore their scars with a swagger. "I'm the baddest" was their common brag.

Harpo himself had not seen the sun in more than a year and was racked with a tubercular cough. Once, as punishment for escape, he had spend six months in solitary in a cell smaller than a closet. Stripped naked, lacking bed or mattress, he could neither stand upright nor lie full length. A thin

stream of water, operated from the outside, flushed his body waste through a drain in the floor. He knew of only one worse punishment. At some prisons the practice was to break spirit in a man by sealing him into a round, nine-foot-deep hole in the ground.

Tattooing, despised in conventional Cuban society, was high machismo. For criminals, it was like war paint. Harpo had had, since the early '60s, an image of Santa Barbara tattooed on his right upper arm. It was done by a cellmate who bound three sewing needles together and pricked at the skin with black soot collected from the burnt handle of a toothbrush.

In the same manner, other outlaws adorned themselves with religious figures, dragons, mermaids, ships, swords and castles. Girls' names and such strangely sentimental phrases as "Without you, I am nothing" were included in the skin gallery. Tattoos covered the entire torsos of some of them. The toughest had numbers and names pricked painfully inside their bottom lips, on their eyelids, even on their genitals. The web of the hand, between thumb and index finger, was used for domino dots, stars and hearts. These hand designs sometimes denoted membership in a macho prison gang. Gangs, for mutual protection or mass attack, were pervasive in the prisons.

#### THE EASY ROAD

Of the 125,000 Cubans who crossed from Mariel before Castro closed down the harbor in September, it was later unofficially estimated that about 25,000 were criminals. The Castro regime refused to give an accounting, and the American social workers and sociologists who interviewed sample groups came up with different numbers.

Officials of the immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), ignorant of the significance of the tattoos, identified fewer than 2000 of the criminal outcasts at the screenings of the new arrivals. These people either confessed a criminal past or were pointed out by refugees who knew them. Most were sent to the federal penitentiary in Atlanta. The State Department tried to get Castro to take some of them back. He flatly refused.

"What happened was unprecedented, unexpected and explosive," said State Department spokesman Arthur Brill, explaining the government's handling of the invasion. "There was an attempt to screen the criminals from the rest of the Cubans, but how do you do that? I dare you to line up 300 Cubans without record books and pick out the three or four criminals. It's very, very difficult."

About half of the throng were released directly to family or friends. The rest—including most of the *escoria*—were transported to live-in processing centers at Florida's Eglin Air Force Base, and at the Army bases of Fort Chaffee in Arkansas, Fort McCoy in Wisconsin and Fort Indiantown Gap in Pennsylvania.

There they remained until relatives or other volunteers were located to sponsor them. Sponsors had only to register their names and addresses, guarantee lodging, and promise to introduce the newcomer to American society. In the early weeks there were long lists of them. The majority were family members or well-meaning citizens. Others were seeking cheap labor. Still others mistakenly thought they would receive monthly compensation from the government.

A patchwork of federal agencies proved inadequate for any careful selection of sponsors. Immigration officers issued visas, or I-

94 forms, placing the Cubans on parole. They were described as "entrants," and treated as applicants for asylum rather than true refugees. This entitled them to take jobs and receive food stamps. As each entrant left detention, his records went to the appropriate district INS office. Soon they were scattered all over the country.

An underworld of Marielitos took root with amazing speed. The word was passed, and they knew exactly where to go—which streets, which houses—to join their own kind. And in their turn, they sponsored comrades from the detention camps. Established Hispanic criminals hired Marielitos pull robberies. Some wormed their way into the narcotics business as runners and hit men for Colombian bosses. A few hired out to auto-theft rings. Mostly, however, they ran in their own packs. With the proceeds of crime, they armed themselves with handguns, shotguns and M-1 carbines. Firepower was machismo.

American justice was not in the least intimidating to the Marielitos, and this accounted in part for the brazenness of their crimes. They knew they could not be deported, and, as the problem evolved, the INS was devoid of any policy or procedure for dealing with them. They were treated in the same manner as any American citizen charged with a crime—pretrial release or detention, court hearings and, if convicted, probation or imprisonment at local or state institutions. After Cuba, it was an easy road to travel.

For homicide departments in Florida's Dade County, preoccupied with the slaughter brought on by the drug wars, the problem with the Marielitos seemed at first to have its own solution. They were so reckless and mentally unhinged that they would wipe each other out.

A partial police listing of Mariel deaths in Dade County explained the notion:

Rolando Rodriguez, 55, stomped to death and Reynaldo Carbonell, 62, beaten to death by the same Marielito, who felt he was "doing society a favor by getting rid of all the *escoria*."

Enrique de Juan, 35, shot in the head by another Marielito in an argument over \$10. Armando Arancibia, 21, stabbed to death on the outskirts of Miami's Little Havana.

Jorge Vita, 26, shot to death on a sidewalk in Little Havana. Vita wore an ax in his belt.

Juan Valdez, 32, shot by his partner as they tried to rob a store on Okeechobee Road, Hialeah.

This last killing was talked about by police as a typically crazy Marielito crime. Valdez walked in the store with a confederate who pulled his gun and announced a stickup. When both the store clerk and Valdez failed to open the cash register, the confederate went into a tantrum. He reached over the counter and struck the clerk with his gun, which accidentally went off and mortally wounded Valdez.

The Marielitos seemed indeed to be less of a threat to the general community than to one another. But that theory was shattered in Miami the night they shot Claribel Benitez, a truly innocent victim.

#### GOVERNMENT NEGLIGENCE

In the short span of two years a criminal force of rogue men, Castro's *escoria*, has embedded itself in American society. It is concentrated in Florida, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, but police in those states say it is spreading. Many of the last Cubans held at Fort Chaffee were sent to correctional institutions in Missouri and Kentucky and to halfway houses in Illinois

and Washington State. They are eligible for release. Predictably, they will link up with others, and they will be dangerous.

Police officers and local courts must necessarily continue to bear the brunt of the task of bringing Marielito outlaws to justice, but they deserve and need the help of the federal government.

The State Department should apply every diplomatic pressure to Fidel Castro to receive deportees. Presently, Marielito felons are being returned to U.S. society once they have served sentence.

The Justice Department should assume responsibility for the incarceration of Marielito felons, who are now doing time in city jails and state prisons. (The Federal Bureau of Prisons took more than 50 of them off Florida's hands in June, but this was a special arrangement and not a change in policy.)

The Department of Justice must also direct one of its agencies to establish a central file of arrest records that can be tapped by all police departments, or, alternatively, develop the METS data bank in Harrisburg to its full potential.

The Dade County Grand Jury has found the "federal policy of benign neglect to be unconscionable." The facts show this conclusion to be completely justified. The federal government let the criminals into America; the government must either get them out or put them where they can do no further harm. ●

#### COMMENDING ALBERT LEE SMITH

#### HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend my good friend and colleague, ALBERT LEE SMITH, for his many accomplishments during the 97th Congress. He has been a quality legislator who has served his country and constituents well.

ALBERT LEE SMITH is a man of compassion who lives his values to the fullest and who makes a powerful statement for his beliefs through daily actions. America needs more persons like ALBERT LEE SMITH in policymaking positions.

One of the characteristics that sets him apart is his understanding that it is the impact of politics upon our families, our freedom, and our economy which is creating our problems. He approaches economic decisions with sensitivity and takes a refreshing, positive approach because he believes we can and should have growth and opportunity.

As a member of the powerful House Budget Committee, ALBERT LEE SMITH is well aware that the course to recovery involves difficult choices that must be made with compassion, but, at the same time, realizes our society has grown used to something-for-nothing expectations. He knows the importance of controlling our budget and



the bureaucracy, and he was instrumental in our successful fight against inflation. And, he has worked consistently and diligently to lower taxes, and to remove bureaucratic control from our lives.

With regard to foreign affairs, ALBERT LEE SMITH approaches policy-making with commonsense. He realizes the stark but unavoidable truth that the Soviet Union has not mellowed and that the goals of communism remain world domination. ALBERT LEE SMITH is a man of peace, but he has acted to repair the sagging state of our defenses for our own best interest, knowing that preparedness is our best defense against blatant aggression.

I am pleased to have served with ALBERT LEE SMITH in the 97th Congress, and I encourage him to continue his involvement in the affairs of our country.●

TED HENSHAW

HON. M. CALDWELL BUTLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, It has been my great privilege to be a part of the American Delegation to a number of meetings of the Interparliamentary Union. I had the opportunity to work closely with Ted Henshaw on several occasions in which he was also a member of our delegation. I enjoyed getting to know him better and to observe the stature he has with his counterparts in the other parliaments of the world.

Ted Henshaw is a very able public servant, and has given most generously of himself in carrying out his duties as Clerk of the House of Representatives. I value his friendship and appreciate his efforts.

I join with my colleagues in wishing him, his wife Barbara, and his family a most pleasant retirement.●

PAUL FINDLEY

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1982

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, soon after I was elected to Congress, I had occasion to visit with my former minister at North Broadway United Methodist Church, Dr. Lance Webb. He was then Bishop of Illinois and a constituent of Congressman PAUL FINDLEY. Bishop Webb said PAUL FINDLEY is a good man and suggested I get acquainted with him. We had a friend in common, so I got to know PAUL pretty well. I came to respect his judgment on agriculture matters and knew he would always give me sound advice on any bill

coming from the Agriculture Committee.

I came to know him as a person of deep concern and dedication to his job.

His courage in taking an unpopular stand on Mideast problems no doubt contributed to his defeat. One day I asked PAUL why he did it. He said with characteristic frankness, "There has to be debate on the problems of the Mideast, and you can't solve the problem if one of the principals is excluded."

I did not always agree with PAUL on his observations from his Foreign Affairs Committee assignment. But I always respected him as an honorable person who sought to do what he believed to be right. The House is losing an exceptional legislator of intelligence and industriousness. PAUL has made a lasting, valuable contribution to our country.

It has been a pleasure to serve in Congress with PAUL FINDLEY. Marjorie and I wish for him and his wife Lucille our very best, knowing they will be active in espousing the ideals in which they believe.

BILL BRODHEAD

HON. JAMES M. SHANNON

OF MASSACHUSETTES

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1982

● Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues who have already participated in a special order honoring Representative BILL BRODHEAD. It is with great regret and hope that I watch BILL leave the House for he has done much for this Congress, his district, and our country.

He has showed us that integrity and innovation, hard work and a sense of fairness can shape good legislation. He has also brought to our attention the need to overcome some of the disadvantages of serving in the House.

The 17th District of Michigan that BILL has served, as well as the Nation as a whole, has had some tough economic times recently, but he has not hesitated to address the demanding issues. The auto industry has been assisted by the House Auto Task Force that he founded and cochaired, and the trade adjustment assistance program that he helped to obtain funds for compensates and retrain workers in industries hurt by foreign competition. BILL has fought hard to reform our tax system as well, to make it more equitable for all.

Also noteworthy is his concern for those who need his care and expertise the most: the elderly, the poor, the young, and the handicapped. Because of his compassion and diligence there is now more support for the services these people need.

BILL's election to the Democratic Study Group chairmanship is another

indication of his outstanding leadership ability and keen understanding of the important legislation before us. He has recognized the need for expanded and improved legislative research and analysis, made us aware of fresh ideas, and has worked energetically with coalitions to find the best possible solutions to today's difficult problems.

I admire the courage in BILL's decision to step aside, and I appreciate his sharing with us the reasons for this decision. His thoughts are ones we should continue to consider.

I will miss BILL's perceptive mind and wit, and his willingness to get involved. I wish him the very best.●

ANTI-JET LAG DIET FROM ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORY

HON. HAROLD WASHINGTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I happened to learn that the Congressional Research Service had received inquiries about an anti-jet lag diet. The diet was developed by a noted biomedical researcher, Dr. Charles F. Ehret of Argonne National Laboratory. Argonne National Laboratory is a multidisciplinary research center with primary focus on nuclear power, basic research, environmental-biomedical studies, and alternate energy sources. The laboratory is operated for the Department of Energy by the University of Chicago. The university is located in my district. I am pleased to share the diet with my colleagues.

The diet grew out of studies of circadian rhythms, natural body cycles controlled by molecular "clocks" found in every cell of the body. Besides aiding travelers, this research has important implications for helping shift workers. Many nuclear power stations are using shift-rotation programs based on this research to help reactor operators adjust quickly to continually changing work shifts.

Anyone traveling across three or more time zones, such as coast-to-coast across the United States, can benefit from the anti-jet lag diet, says Charles Ehret.

Left to its own devices, the body normally needs 1 day to adjust for each time zone crossed. But proper use of the Argonne diet can help the traveler make the change in 1 day.

Thousands of travelers have used this diet to prevent or ease the discomfort and inconvenience of jet lag. The U.S. Army used Dr. Ehret's research to help devise plans for moving troops great distances and having them arrive alert and ready for action.

Many airline travelers are learning to prevent jet lag—or at least speed up

their recovery times—by using the Argonne diet plan. Jet lag is a feeling of irritability, insomnia, indigestion, and general disorientation. It occurs when the body's inner clock is out of synchronization with time cues from the environment. The Argonne diet uses some of the same time cues that create jet lag to prevent it.

Time cues include meal times, sunrise and sunset, and daily cycles of rest and activity. These cues help keep the body on schedule and healthy. The Argonne diet uses a combination of time cues to speed the traveler's adjustment to a new schedule.

The diet requires a planned rescheduling of mealtimes, meal contents, and social cues to help reset the body clock. The trick is to prepare for the adjustment a few days ahead of time by carefully watching the amounts and types of food eaten at mealtimes. By the day of arrival, the body's clock has been reset by assuming the schedule of meals and activities appropriate for the new time zone.

For example, traveler begins the anti-jet-lag diet on Thursday, 3 days before a flight. Thursday is a feast day, to be followed by fasting on Friday, feasting on Saturday and fasting on Sunday. The day of the flight is always a fast day.

On feast days, the traveler eats three full meals. Breakfast and lunch are high in protein. Steak and eggs make a good breakfast, followed later by meat and green beans for lunch. Protein helps the body produce chemicals that wake it up and get it going.

Supper is high in carbohydrates. They help the body produce chemicals that bring on sleep. Spaghetti or another pasta is good, but no meatballs—they contain protein.

On fast days, the traveler eats three small meals. They are all low in carbohydrates and calories to help deplete the liver's store of carbohydrates. "We do not fully understand the reasons," say Ehret, "but this seems to speed the shift to a new time zone." Acceptable meals on fast days would contain 700 calories or less and might consist of skimpy salads, thin soups, and half-slices of bread.

Whether feasting or fasting, the traveler drinks coffee, or any other drink containing caffeine, only in the afternoon. This is the one time of day when caffeine seems to have no effect on the body's rhythms.

Sunday evening, the traveler boards the plane about 7 p.m. and begins the first phase of speeding up the body's internal clock to Paris time. He or she drinks several cups of coffee between 9 and 10 p.m., turns off the overhead light and goes to sleep.

About 1:30 a.m. New York time, the traveler wakes up—the coffee consumed before going to sleep may even help do this—and takes the final steps

that reset the body's clock to Paris time.

First, he or she eats a high protein breakfast without coffee—perhaps last night's supper saved until the new breakfast time. Most airlines will gladly agree to this request. The meal helps the body wake up and synchronize itself with the Parisians, who are eating breakfast at about the same time.

Second, having finished breakfast, the traveler stays active to keep the body working on Paris time. The other passengers are asleep, but the traveler is walking the aisles, talking to the flight attendants or working with a briefcase on the pull-down table in front of his or her seat.

Monday afternoon in Paris, the traveler has a high-protein lunch. Steak is a good choice. That evening, he or she eats a high-carbohydrate supper—crepes, for example, but with no high-protein meat filling—and goes to bed early.

Tuesday morning, the traveler has little or no jet lag.

On the return trip, the procedure is reversed, with one change. Going from east to west, the traveler wants to turn the body clock back 6 hours so that upon arrival at, say, 10 p.m. New York time, the body's clock is not still set at 4 a.m. Paris time.

The same feast-fast-feast-fast procedure is followed as before, except that plenty of coffee is consumed the morning before the flight and the morning of the flight, but avoided in the afternoon and evening of both days.

After boarding the plane, the traveler again coordinates his or her schedule with that of the destination. The fast is broken with a large, high-protein breakfast at about the same time New Yorkers are eating theirs.

Ehret points out that the diet can be flexible. He says that if you do not have time to alternate feasting and fasting for 3 days, just fast on the day you leave. Follow the rest of the plan accordingly. It may not prevent jet lag entirely, but it will speed up the adjustment.

I hope my colleagues and their staffs who will be traveling for the holidays will benefit from this diet.

I also hope, that when the 98th Congress convenes in January, they will be mindful of the millions of Americans for whom traveling and dieting are not an issue.●

#### HENRY REUSS

#### HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1982

● Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I feel truly privileged to have served with

HENRY REUSS in the House. He has been a great Member of Congress. HENRY is an extremely talented, highly respected Member of Congress who will be missed.

HENRY has a genuine concern and warmth for people. In addition, he is one of the truly intellectual Members of the House. His range of knowledge is extraordinary, and even though you might not always agree with HENRY, you know you will learn something if you listen to him.

He is, at the same time, a very hard-working person. With his brilliant, insightful, and energetic mind, he has made a lasting and significant contribution to our democracy.

He has a delightful sense of humor, a masterful command of the English language, and a loyalty to his friends which gains him admiration, respect, and the genuine affection of his many friends.

HENRY is a great credit to his hometown of Milwaukee. By choosing HENRY REUSS to represent them, the people of Milwaukee have helped make a sounder Nation.

In his work on the Banking Committee and the Joint Economic Committee, where I had the privilege to serve with him, HENRY earned a reputation for integrity and dedication. He leaves Congress knowing that he has served his Nation with honor and distinction. We have lost an outstanding Member who will, indeed, be missed.

My wife Marjorie joins me in wishing for HENRY and his wife Margaret the very best for a bright future and an enjoyable life ahead.●

#### TRAINING TERRORISTS IN U.N. CAMPS

#### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the U.S. Congress, I am increasingly alarmed at the success of Soviet expansion backed by an ever-increasing Soviet military buildup.

For example, the United States has not built a new intercontinental ballistic missile since 1965—13 years ago. The Soviets have built and deployed thousands of missiles with nuclear warheads in a position to dominate Western Europe.

Parallel with its military buildup, the U.S.S.R. is rapidly advancing its "resource war" to place its surrogates in control of governments of countries in Africa where oil and strategic minerals such as chromium, uranium, and the platinum group are located. Without oil and critical minerals from the Mideast and southern Africa, the 16 industrialized countries of the West,



including the United States, will be subject to Soviet "blackmail" and chaotic economic disruption.

The United Nations, which costs U.S. taxpayers \$1 billion a year in hard-earned tax dollars, misuses millions of those dollars each year to finance Soviet-sponsored terrorists such as the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and the African National Congress (ANC), which struggle to seize control of strategic areas such as Lebanon, Namibia, and Afghanistan, and impose Marxist dictatorships in furtherance of Soviet expansionism. Congress must act to stop U.N. misuse of American taxpayer money to subsidize terrorism.

I invite attention to the following article from the December 16, 1982, Washington Times which tells an appalling story.

**TRAINING TERRORISTS IN U.N. CAMPS**  
(By Thomas Gulick)

The military use of United Nations refugee camps by the Palestine Liberation Organization, which was revealed during the Israeli occupation of Lebanon, is just the tip of the iceberg. There is now considerable evidence that Soviet-backed guerrillas are also using U.N. camps in southern Africa and Central America for similar purposes. Even more disheartening is the fact that the United States is picking up the tab for 25 percent, and often more, of the operating costs of these training camps.

Recently captured PLO documents show that the Siblun Training Center, a U.N. trade school near Beirut, was used to train PLO military recruits.

Yet another document intercepted by Israeli forces reveals that the PLO used U.N. International Force in Lebanon intelligence reports to monitor Israeli troop movements. The captured documents were dated May 26, 1981.

A Heritage Foundation report dated April 8, 1982—several months before the Israeli move into Lebanon—quoted Lebanese officials as saying the PLO had "transformed most of the (Lebanese) refugee camps—if not all—into military bastions." The charges were emphatically denied by U.N. officials.

As early as 1976, U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim had been informed in writing that the PLO had installed "heavy weapons" in U.N. refugee camps in Lebanon. Lebanese officials also told Waldheim that the PLO had "even occupied the UNRWA (U.N. Relief Works Agency) offices in the camps." This was confirmed by the Israeli invasion discoveries.

The use of U.N. camps and "schools" in other parts of the world by Marxist terrorists has gone virtually unreported in the press.

For instance, in southern Africa, the Southwest African People's Organization, another Marxist guerrilla organization, is recognized by the U.N. as the "sole and authentic" representative of the Namibian people, even though there are some 45 political parties in that African country. The U.N. and its specialized agencies have allocated some \$40 million to SWAPO for U.N. programs begun between 1977 and 1981 and new programs slated for the 1982-to-1986 period.

Among these programs is the SWAPO-controlled Institute for Namibia, located in

Lusaka, Zambia. Between 1977 and 1981, about \$1 million in U.N. funds went annually to finance the institute. In 1982 a handful of U.N. member-nations pledged an additional \$2 million. The United States' pledge of \$500 thousand for 1982 was by far the largest.

While the institute is charged by the U.N. with responsibility to train administrators for a future independent Namibia, serve as an information center on Namibia; perform research on Namibia, and aid in the "struggle for freedom of the Namibian people" in practice, it would appear that only SWAPO members are accepted as students at the institute and that the school is used for SWAPO military training.

Located in Zambia, the Institute for Namibia provides SWAPO with a strategic site for a military training center. With its common border with Angola—the point for which SWAPO launches its terrorist attacks into Namibia—a more suitable spot would be hard to find.

One might ask why no U.N. members have questioned whether the Institute is being used by SWAPO to train officers and troops for guerrillas warfare in Namibia.

On March 28, 1981, New York Times correspondent Bernard Nossiter reported for Angola that yet another U.N. facility was being commandeered by SWAPO for its terror campaign—the Namibian Health and Education Center in Luanda, Angola. The camp is run by the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees. Nossiter said SWAPO was using this camp to train students aged 5 to 18 as guerrillas to be returned to Namibia.

The Times newsman also said a nearby U.N. women's camp with a population of 25,000 seems to be SWAPO-dominated.

Further evidence of U.N. support of Marxist terrorism is evident in Botswana, just south of Zambia. Here, the African National Congress, a thoroughly Marxist terror organization aimed at overthrowing the government of South Africa, uses a U.N. refugee camp in Dukwe as a recruiting center for terrorists, according to military sources there.

And within the very borders of South Africa, the tiny country of Lesotho hosts another refugee center run the UNHCR auspices, which also is suspected of being an ANC recruiting center. Refugees recruited there and in Botswana are moved to military and terrorist training centers in Angola, Tanzania, Algeria, Eastern Europe and the U.S.S.R. This was confirmed in recent testimony by former ANC members during hearings before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism.

In the Western Hemisphere, there also is strong evidence that U.N. refugee camps in Central America are being used to train Marxist guerrillas and terrorists.

A UNHCR camp at La Virtud, Honduras has supplied food and medicine to Marxist guerrillas staging raids into El Salvador, according to Heritage Foundation Latin American expert Richard Araujo. In addition, Araujo says, the French medical volunteer group, Medecins Sans Frontieres, which is part of the UNHCR operation in the Honduras refugee camps, is funneling intelligence reports to the Communist-oriented Sandanista army of Nicaragua.

It is high time the United States and its Western Allies demand a full internal investigation of U.N. aid and support for terrorist groups which operate freely in refugee camps in the middle East, southern Africa and Latin America.

These investigative teams should include representatives of the United States and the

Western nations, which pay the lion's share of the tab for the U.N. refugee program.

In addition, the U.S. Congress, General Accounting Office, and Central Intelligence Agency should conduct their own intensive investigation into all aspects of U.N. support for terrorist and guerrilla groups and subversives of all kinds—including those directed by the Soviet KGB, the U.S.S.R.'s secret police, which considers the U.N.'s New York headquarters its home away from home.

The United States and the West can make a bid dent in U.N. funding of international terrorism and Marxist guerrillas movement by cutting off all U.S. contributions to U.N. organizations backing terrorist and guerrillas cadres until this practice is stopped. U.S. taxpayers can help stop the flow of aid to terrorists simply by refusing to give their money to those at the U.N. who would abuse our trust and the legitimate needs of the world's refugee population.●

**NHTSA**

**HON. JOHN L. BURTON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Government Activities and Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, I have had the opportunity to examine some of the vehicle defect investigations conducted by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), including the vehicle defect inquiry into General Motors' Corvair. The subcommittee staff's analysis of NHTSA's Corvair materials revealed numerous deficiencies in the design and implementation of the NHTSA Corvair investigation, deficiencies which suggest that NHTSA must modify and improve its investigative procedures so as to better insure that defective automobiles are properly identified, so that they may be promptly recalled and not be allowed to remain on American highways.

During the 18 years since Ralph Nader first exposed the designed in defects of General Motors' (GM) Corvair automobile, much additional evidence has emerged from product liability cases, Government test, GM whistle-blowers, former GM executives, and congressional investigations and reports—evidence that further documents and supports Mr. Nader's original thesis that the rear-engine Corvair was a menace to life and limb because of its marked tendency to go out of control and roll over, especially when cornering. This thesis was put forth in his bestselling book, "Unsafe At Any Speed" in which Nader claimed that Corvair accidents were caused by the tendency of the outside rear wheel to tuck under the chassis during turns. GM management concealed these defects from the public, Nader charged, and did not change the defective

design until the 1965 model year, even though they were aware of the defects as early as the late 1950's.

During those same 18 years since the publication of "Unsafe At Any Speed," General Motors has been working steadily and determinedly to shape the Corvair historical record, a record which, when unencumbered by GM roadblocks, reflects most unfavorably upon the social, moral, and legal stature of one of the world's largest manufacturing multinational corporations and its management.

From a safety point of view, the evidence is clear, overwhelming, and convincing: General Motors manufactured and marketed 1.2 million unsafe Corvairs for the 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963 model years, knew about the inherent safety defects, yet did nothing to correct them. From the point of view of honesty and integrity, the evidence is also clear, overwhelming, and convincing: General Motors has sought at every turn to conceal and suppress evidence showing that the Corvair was unsafe, and that GM did little to remedy a situation that was causing unnecessary death and injury on the highway. Taken as a whole, the record shows that in manufacturing and marketing the Corvair, GM acted in reckless disregard of human life.

As chairman of the Government Activities and Transportation Subcommittee, I have had a special opportunity to observe the operations of powerful interests seeking to work their wills on the Congress. GM has persisted in its attempt over the years to mold the history of the Corvair, sometimes by bending the facts, sometimes by suppressing the facts, and other times by creating new facts.

Before reviewing the methods GM and its sympathizers have employed in attempting to wipe the slate clean on the Corvair, for the record, I will briefly outline the evidence on the safety of the Corvair—what GM knew about the Corvair's unsafe characteristics and when GM knew it. No amount of suppression or deception can overcome the weight of the evidence listed below, evidence that constitutes the bedrock of the case against GM and the Corvair:

One, GM's own secret proving ground reports detailing tests dating from 1959-63. These early tests (Proving Ground Reports (PGR) 11106 (June 1959) and 11543 (November 1959)) show that GM was aware of the Corvair's instability before production. They show the Corvair rolling over at speeds as low as 25 mph in simple j-turn—emergency obstacle avoidance—maneuvers.

Two, 1968 Ford Motor Co., test of the Corvair. Ford put the Corvair alongside of some of its own cars and ran them through lane change maneuvers. While none of the Fords had any significant difficulty with the maneu-

vers, the Corvair would often go out of control with the rear of the car losing traction, causing it to spin.

Three, Maurice Olley patent application. Maurice Olley, GM's preeminent engineer in the field of vehicle handling, filed a patent application in 1956 in which he was highly critical of rear-engine automobiles with swing axles, such as the Corvair.

Four, 1964 first change to new suspension. Corvair's 1960 suspension was chosen primarily for reasons of cost to the manufacturer, service, reliability, quality of ride, isolation of passengers from suspension, harshness and noise. Safety was not a major factor. Then, in 1964, GM changed to a modified rear end suspension, a more fundamental suspension change, known to GM for years, was introduced in the 1965 model year. GM tests made at the time indicated that safety was the primary reason for the change. In one test description, GM implicitly admitted the inherent unsafe nature of its own Corvairs, model years 1960-63:

These tests showed that the dynamic quality of the current production 1963 Corvair was not substantially improved through practical modifications to shock absorber design and configuration \*\*\*.

A 1964 prototype suspension installed in the car made the dynamic stability characteristics acceptable for several different test conditions.

Five, 1971 GM tire test. This internal GM document states explicitly that the Corvair handling could become "unacceptable under some driving conditions."

Six, DeLorean Book. In January 1980, J. Patrick Wright published a book based on his conversations with former GM engineer and group vice-president John Z. DeLorean. DeLorean expressed the following views about the Corvair:

\*\*\* the Corvair was unsafe as it was originally designed.

In the high-performance Corvair, the car conveyed a false sense of control to the driver when in fact he may have been very close to losing control of the vehicle. The result of these characteristics can be fatal.

These problems with the Corvair were well documented inside GM's Engineering Staff long before the Corvair was ever offered for sale.

The questionable safety of the car caused a massive internal fight among GM's engineers over whether the car should be built with another form of suspension.

These men collectively—Charles Chayne, Von D. Polhemus and others—and individually made vigorous attempts inside GM to keep the Corvair, as designed, out of production or to change the suspension system to make the car safer.

Albert Roller, who worked for me in Pontiac's advanced engineering section, tested the car and pleaded with me not to use it at Pontiac.

Seven, October 1, 1959, Ford Motor Co. presentation to their executive committee. Ford ordered handling

tests of a wide range of Ford and other make cars. The Corvair was tested and filmed. The film was shown to Ford's executive committee with the following explanation:

The handling and stability of the Falcon (Ford) are excellent. The Corvair with its rear heavyweight distribution shows marked instability under conditions of severe cornering and in passing. While the driver will not encounter difficulty under most normal driving conditions, there are frequently encountered emergency conditions such as slippery pavement or emergency maneuvering in which the driver cannot maintain control of the vehicle. The Corvair falls considerably short of our (Ford) handling standards.

Eight, testimony of Robert Benzinger, General Motors engineer in charge of the Corvair engine. On August 12, 1966, Benzinger gave a deposition in a case involving a man who suffered permanent brain damage as the result of driving long distances in a Corvair with a defectively designed heating system that permitted lethal carbon monoxide gas from the engine—in the rear—to mix with the air entering the vehicle passenger compartment through the direct air heater. During the deposition, Benzinger admitted: (1) that any malfunction of the engine which permitted the emission of carbon monoxide would result in carbon monoxide being carried by the heating system into the passenger compartment; (2) GM knew that it was not possible to design with certainty an aluminum engine of the type to be used in the Corvair which would not malfunction and leak carbon monoxide; (3) GM had considered the possible danger of a carbon monoxide leakage from the engine and had therefore upgraded the quality of the engine seals and exhaust manifolds; and (4) GM had considered but had not adopted a shield device to prevent contact between engine cooling air and passenger compartment warming air. The state of the art in other vehicles was such that occupants were not placed at risk of breathing carbon monoxide fumes, as they were in the Corvair.

General Motors effort to whitewash this record first emerged publicly after the publication of Nader's book. In an attempt to intimidate the Corvair's primary critic, GM launched a private investigation of Nader. In January 1966, one of the detectives following Nader was detected in a Senate Office Building on Capitol Hill trailing Nader. When this incident was made public, GM's initial attempt at suppression began to unravel.

James Roche, then president of General Motors, later would go before a Senate committee and tell the assembled Congressmen and media:

To the extent that General Motors bears responsibility, I want to apologize here and now to the members of this subcommittee



and Mr. Nader. I sincerely hope that these apologies will be accepted. Certainly I bear Mr. Nader no ill will.

At these hearings, representatives of General Motors maintained, as they had throughout the controversy, that the Corvair was not an unsafe car, that the Corvair was, in effect, a safe car. As evidence to support these assertions, GM cited two jury verdicts which found that the Corvair's design was not the cause of the crash injuries involved in each case. But the Corvair juries and the Senate subcommittee that heard GM's testimony on March 22, 1966, were not getting the damning information that GM had stashed away in its files. They were not getting the warnings that the company received from its own engineer Maurice Olley, they were not getting GM's preproduction testing reports that detailed the flipping Corvairs on J-turns, nor were they getting all of the information about the carbon monoxide leakage problem and the safety problems attendant thereto. Subsequent juries in Corvair trials did bring in sizable verdicts against GM, not to mention many sizable settlements with plaintiffs that GM concluded.

In 1971, an investigation was launched by Senator Abraham Ribicoff's Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization to determine whether GM had misled the subcommittee. The resulting highly controversial Ribicoff report, written by two staff members, found that the subcommittee was not misled by General Motors. But the report came under immediate and justifiable criticism from many quarters, including Ralph Nader's staff which issued an eloquent, lengthy, and piercing rebuttal. The Nader staff report concluded that the Ribicoff report was "marred by faulty methodology, technical incompetence, and inaccurate assertions." "It read like a GM brief," wrote the Nader report authors.

A close examination of the Ribicoff staff report reveals three problem areas that raise serious doubts about the accuracy of the report's conclusions. First, the staff refused to consider as relevant the most damning evidence against GM and the Corvair—the preproduction GM proving ground reports which detailed how Corvairs flipped over while maneuvering J-turns at moderate speeds. The report discounts these GM proving ground reports, first because they are "not representative of the practical driving environment." The staff here echoes former GM president Ed Cole's assertion that the J-turn test are "violent maneuvers designed to overturn" the cars. In fact, most impartial experts agree that a J-turn test determines a car's response in an emergency reaction to a suddenly perceived obstacle in its path—not an uncommon occurrence. While probably no other

American cars could be overturned in such a J-turn test, a 1962 Corvair rolled over twice in a simple 28 mph J-turn (PG 17103).

Another criticism that the Ribicoff staff had about these early GM proving ground reports was that they did not involve Corvairs identical to production Corvairs. In fact, the differences were insignificant. Modifications to the test cars were all minor changes to items such as shock absorbers and spring rates, modifications that have been characterized by GM engineers as "not significantly affecting the handling or stability of the Corvair."

The importance of these preproduction GM proving ground tests cannot be underestimated. Corporate criminologists consider them incriminating pieces of evidentiary material ranking right up with the "Asbestos Papers" and the "Thalidomide Files." The Ribicoff staff's failure to give substantial weight to these reports severely undermines the staff's primary conclusion that the subcommittee was not misled since "the performance of the 1960-63 Corvair compares favorably in stability and handling to similar contemporary cars."

Second, the Ribicoff staff uncritically accepted the conclusions of the July 1972 NHTSA evaluation of the Corvair, a report that put its stamp of approval on the car. The Ribicoff staff report virtually ignores the conclusions of physicist Dr. Carl Nash's detailed and reasoned critique of the NHTSA study. "A Critique of the NHTSA Defect Investigation of the 1960-63 Corvair Handling Stability," by Dr. Carl Nash, December 2, 1973.

The Ribicoff staff accepts NHTSA's conclusions about the Corvair despite a gross testing irregularity that should have rendered the primary NHTSA conclusion about the Corvair's stability meaningless. Before NHTSA conducted its tests, the Corvairs were weighted down with 615 extra pounds. This procedure is called heavy loading. There is strong evidence that indicates that heavy loading increases a car's stability. The evidence of heavy loading should have led any reasonable observer to strongly question NHTSA's conclusion that "the handling and stability performance of the 1960-63 Corvair does not result in abnormal potential for loss of control or rollover." The Ribicoff staff's acceptance of this conclusion, coupled with an overriding obsession with secrecy<sup>1</sup>, raises important questions of impartial judgment and bias.

Even more damaging to the report's conclusions was the revelation in 1973 that NHTSA engineers had secretly removed the 615 extra pound weight, then retested the Corvair. The Corvair

overturned repeatedly during these tests. The NHTSA engineers withheld this information until after the release of the NHTSA and Senate reports.

Third, at the March 22, 1966 committee hearing, GM cited its litigation record as a definitive sign of the Corvair's safety. Yet the Ribicoff report failed to critically question whether GM withheld crucial documents from plaintiffs attorneys seeking discovery. A close examination of a handful of cases where Corvair victims or Corvair victims' survivors sued GM found that GM attorneys suppressed, distorted, and concealed evidence relevant to these products liability cases. In addition, GM harassed plaintiffs' attorneys through a variety of tactics, including intentionally supplying thousands of irrelevant documents and films, flooding victims attorneys with meaningless motions and objections, and hiring private investigators to probe expert witnesses.

GM had a coordinated defense effort for the hundreds of Corvair product liability cases that were brought against it around the country. Indicative of the sophistication of this effort was a GM memorandum dated January 5, 1965 and titled "Hypothetical Cross-Examination of a Member of the Corvair Product Analysis Group." The memo carefully, but unethically, instructs GM witnesses in legal proceedings how to give obscure, evasive, and nonresponsive answers during cross-examination while attempting to ascertain the true nature of the Corvair's unsafe characteristics by injured parties.

General Motors also made it a practice to close off plaintiffs lawyers who gained access to especially damaging information. In the case referred to above, where GM's Benzinger gave damaging information about the Corvair's propensity to leak carbon monoxide, GM rushed in and offered to settle the case for \$125,000, but only if the plaintiffs lawyer would sell GM all his depositions, information from expert witnesses, his entire file, and the Corvair car itself. Additionally, the law firm signed a statement pledging not to talk, write or otherwise promulgate facts about the case. GM also demanded that the original complaint be changed from alleging "design defect" to "manufacturing defect." Had the wording remained "design defect" other victims' attorneys would be able to use the settlement as evidence that GM admitted to a fleet wide defect. "Manufacturing defect" only indicates that something was wrong with that one car.

So while GM settled or blocked a majority of the Corvair cases brought against it, it did so through heavy handed procedural moves and inundative costs individual attorneys found difficult to handle. GM's litigation

<sup>1</sup> All Ribicoff documents from GM which include 80 depositions have been sealed and stored at the National Archives until the year 2000.

record indicates only that GM's strategy of narrowing the flow of pertinent information into the courthouse was succeeding.

The Ribicoff staff committee's primary conclusion that a congressional subcommittee was not misled by General Motors cannot be supported by the weight of the evidence. And the critical NHTSA defect inquiry into the Corvair, upon which the Ribicoff staff uncritically relied, was riddled with procedural deficiencies that undermined its conclusions.

First, the engineer responsible for the Corvair test program was previously employed by General Motors for 18 years. Second, a factor that was crucial in the DOT test of the Corvair's performance was the tires. The agency apparently used special tires supplied by GM on the cars tested. The quality of the tires and the amount of inflation could be critical in determining whether the Corvair behaved beyond the driver's control. But the agency

did not test the Corvair with partially worn tires such as would be found under normal driving conditions. In addition, NHTSA withheld a critical GM tire report for 2 years after receipt and then failed to properly alert the public of the findings. Third, the NHTSA Corvair investigation was conducted in a completely ad hoc manner. The NHTSA engineers never formulated a program for what turned out to be a very unscientific investigation that resulted in unscientific conclusions. NHTSA selectively highlighted its preconceived ideas and discounted or ignored materials which didn't support their conclusions. The GM pre-production proving ground tests, for example, were ignored or dismissed as irrelevant.

There is no indication that NHTSA has modified its testing procedures so as to prevent similar deficiencies that might disable future defect investigations. Before launching on a defect inquiry, NHTSA should make public its

proposed plan for study for public comment to insure that any biases and predetermined conclusions are not written into the early stages of the study. Second, any final report should permit the interested public to review all the raw test data and test procedures of the investigation. This is the proper scientific approach to assure accountability and higher standards. In its Corvair inquiry, NHTSA prohibited examination by the public of the raw data and test procedures, thus fueling suspicion and putting a cloud over the credibility of the report. And the agency should review and more actively oversee its rules governing NHTSA employees who conduct investigations of automobile companies for whom they had worked before they were hired at the agency.

It is hoped that this report will be helpful to NHTSA in improving the credibility and accuracy of any future vehicle design and construction testing inquiries.●